

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on further consideration of H.R. 2264, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 31, 1997, and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2264.

□ 1149

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2264) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Chairman pro tempore, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, September 9, 1997, the bill was open for amendment from page 64, line 1, through page 65, line 3.

Are there any amendments to this portion of the bill?

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. PETERSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 43 offered by Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania:

Page 64, line 7, after each dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$20,000,000)".

Page 69, line 26, after each dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$20,000,000)".

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to ask for support for the Peterson-Blunt amendment. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], chairman of the subcommittee, for his willingness to facilitate this amendment. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], ranking member, for his cooperation, and I would also like to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLUNT] for his support of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is offered to reaffirm actions taken by the

House at the end of July. Before we left, this body overwhelmingly adopted H.R. 1853, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Amendments Act, by a vote of 414 to 12.

Mr. Chairman, it was this tremendous support that encouraged me to offer this amendment. The amendment which I am offering today will increase the vocational education basic State grant account by \$20 million, with an offset from the Goals 2000 Program.

Vocational education is a very essential part of our educational system and particularly for rural America. For a variety of reasons, a postsecondary education is not the answer for every student, with many of them living in rural America. In fact, about half of our Nation's graduating senior class will choose to attend college and roughly half of those will receive a degree.

Mr. Chairman, a responsible and appropriate avenue for outfitting the rest of our Nation's youth with the skills to make them attractive and competitive in the job market is a commitment from the Federal Government in assisting local schools. The best avenue for this commitment is through continued support of vocational education.

Mr. Chairman, true education reform will only take place at the local level. It is time that we provide the resources to our schools to make the needed and necessary changes for improvement. H.R. 1853 will enable this to happen by directing more funds to local education agencies and removing a number of requirements which prevent school districts from taking steps necessary for providing an appropriate academic education.

How significant is a \$20 million increase for a program funded at nearly \$1 billion? In these times of budget constraint, any increase is significant. However, Mr. Chairman, if H.R. 1853 were law, the formula that we have in it will drive 90 percent of the money down to the school districts, where historically under the current vocational act only 75 percent of the money actually reached the school districts. So this will be a significant increase, the 2 percent that the \$20 million will give.

Mr. Chairman, to put this another way, a 2-percent increase will enable a 20-percent increase in funding for local education agencies if the House-passed measure becomes law. Being a legislator for nearly 20 years now, I have always felt it was important to reinforce legislative improvements through the budget process.

By adopting the Peterson-Blunt amendment, we will be doing just that and sending a message to the American people that we are serious about legislation enacted by this body. Vocational education is a vital program for the future of America.

This legislation, overwhelmingly agreed to, is good legislation. I urge my colleagues to support both. Support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the amendment is agreeable to

both sides and will be accepted. For that I again thank the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Wisconsin for their willingness to work with us.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, we believe that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON] offers an excellent amendment, and we will accept the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am frankly of mixed views on this amendment. Let me simply recite for the committee what has already transpired with respect to Goals 2000.

Mr. Chairman, last year Goals was funded at \$491 million level. The administration asked for a \$620 million funding level this year. The bill as reported by the committee cut Goals 2000 to \$475 million, which is \$16 million below the previous year.

On the floor, we had an amendment adopted which cut it further to \$462 million, and now this amendment cuts it to \$442 million.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply point out to the House that this Goals 2000 issue, which has become so politicized, started out as a joint effort of President Bush and the National Governors. The person who headed up, or one of the two Governors who headed up the Governors' Task Force on Education, working with the President, was a fellow by the name of then-Gov. Bill Clinton. I remember going to a conference and talking with a number of Governors, including then-Governor Clinton, about it.

Mr. Chairman, I am baffled by why it has become so politicized, and I have misgivings about this amendment. But I am willing to accept it as a gesture of goodwill, indicating flexibility on our part. But I have to say in the process that as this bill moves through, it is important to remember that there are three different groups who have to be satisfied in the end for this legislation to pass. The legislative priorities of the majority in this House have to be respected; the legislative priorities of the minority in this House have to be respected; and so do the legislative priorities of the President.

That does not mean we have to rubber stamp everything that he does, and we do not have to rubber stamp everything that each other does. But I think that we are at a point where we have cut this program far enough.

Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the gentleman's amendment. I have been a longtime supporter of vocational education. The first issue I ran on when I ran for the State legislature was reform of vocational education. When I was in the legislature, we created on a bipartisan basis an entirely new system of vocational education and technical schools in my own State.

So, recognizing that, I am willing to accept the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON], but I would simply say that I think we have gone far enough and I hope we can move on and get away from using this program as a punching bag, because I think it is not the only tool that is useful, but it is certainly one of the tools which, used in concert with others, can help to raise standards and to raise performance. And that is, after all, what I think the Federal role ought to be in the area of education.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, and particularly thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON] for working so hard to put this amendment together and to make it work.

Mr. Chairman, I have been trying in this debate to find some additional money for vocational education. I think this movement forward is helpful. We had frozen vocational education at last year's funding at a time when I think we are working in every possible way to get people to the workplace, people who have not been there before through welfare reform; people who are out of high school or did not get out of high school who need additional training.

Vocational education is critically important. I am certainly glad to hear both the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the chairman, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member, agree to accept this change to add this money to vocational education.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to this amendment becoming part of the package that the House passes, and then I am hopeful that we will also be committed, realizing what I just heard about the importance of everybody being in agreement, to uphold the House's position and keep this additional \$20 million for vocational education in this bill when it comes back to the House from conference.

This is an important step, going along with the step that we have already taken in passing the authorization legislation that, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania has pointed out, sets a new standard of money in vocational education that gets to the classroom where students are affected by it.

□ 1200

That new standard of 90 percent, essentially under local control and maybe, more importantly, under the control of a local teacher, of the teacher in the classroom, as opposed to 75 percent, is an important standard for us to meet. To add to that some additional funding for vocational education in a program that is critical to the future of the country is going to be a good thing to see.

I hope we see it in the final bill as well. I am grateful that the chairman and the ranking member have agreed

to be supportive of this amendment and grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON] for not only letting me work with him but for working so hard to put this amendment together.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOB SCHAFFER OF COLORADO

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado:

Page 64, line 7, after each dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$40,000,000)".

Page 65, lines 7 and 8, after each dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$40,000,000)".

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, this amendment doubles the \$40 million provided for prevention and intervention programs for children and youth who are neglected and delinquent or at risk of dropping out by transferring \$40 million from the Goals 2000 Program. This formula grant program provides services to participants in institutions for juvenile delinquents, correctional institutions, and institutions for the neglected.

The bill calls for \$39,311,000, which is about a little over a million less than the budget request and the same as fiscal year 1997. Arrest rates for juveniles have more than tripled in the last decade. The average stay in youth correction facilities is about 1 year for crimes against persons, 248 days for drug offenses, and 17 days for weapons crimes. The total number of juveniles arrested that are under the age of 18 rose 20.1 percent between 1991 and 1995. The need for education is growing. Giving incarcerated juveniles an education is something that liberals and conservatives can both agree on and understand that it benefits children and the public.

Juvenile crime has increased significantly over the last few years and represents an alarming and tragic trend. A good education is one of the few things that can help children out of a life of crime and despair and give them the tools to live a productive and happy life. Without education, these children remain without hope.

High school dropouts similarly need special consideration since they are all but doomed to a life of poverty. The needed money that this amendment represents will go to State programs to prevent at-risk children from dropping out. The amendment would take money out of the hands of a program that is totally administrative and put it into the hands of vulnerable children and their teachers specifically but directly to assist vulnerable children.

The Government has asked for \$475 million for the Goals 2000 Program but

only \$40 million for these at-risk children. The \$40 million increase that we are proposing in this amendment will show in a more direct and a more positive way our commitment to these children.

In my State, 1,165 children are served in various State programs at the State level and local level that these funds are directed to. That's just in my State as an example.

The amendment, of course, applies nationally. These funds are distributed to State and local programs. These are local dollars that we would be empowering. State grants go directly to the facilities where these children are taught and into homes for delinquent and abandoned or neglected children. They are used to hire teachers, provide supplementary education for children who are not achieving at their grade level and who are failing to meet State standards in academic areas, and those who are targeted as at great risk of dropping out. Funds are, and what has been known as the title I program, that is the shift we are attempting to make.

Mr. Chairman, let me just state again that with respect to children who are at risk, those at risk of dropping out of school because of the economic setting or situation that they may be in or any other conditions that may lead to that particular designation are worthy of our attention here in Congress and States, I would submit, are most capable of assisting them. These dollars just support States and local communities, people who know what they are doing and have achieved real results.

One of the individuals back in my home State in the Department of Education commented that this particular area in education is the most neglected area of assisting children in our education system and could use not only the dollars that the small amount that we are proposing in the amendment but far beyond that.

I think the \$40 million shift is a reasonable amount, one which I suspect will be supported widely and is greatly anticipated not only by the young children who deserve our thought and consideration, our support and help, but those who are committed to them, their teachers, parents in many cases, and those who are also dedicated to improving the lives of children back in our home States.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] insist on the point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is another in a series of amendments being offered by a small band of Members on the other side of the aisle to, in essence, on an amendment-by-amendment basis gut one of the two top priorities of the President in this bill.

I did not vote for the budget agreement. I have minimum high regard for the budget agreement. I think that in many ways the budget agreement that was endorsed by a majority of both parties is a public lie because I do not believe that the spending cuts which are contained in that budget agreement will, in fact, in the fourth and fifth years, be voted for by Members of either party. But nonetheless, the Congress adopted it.

When we did so, we reached certain understandings with both branches of Government and with both parties. That understanding was that, as I said earlier, the priorities of each of the parties, the priorities of the President would be largely respected.

We have already seen now two cuts adopted on the House floor with respect to goals. This cuts another \$40 million out of one of the President's top two priorities, so we have already seen one of the President's top two priorities reduced by a substantial amount.

The account to which the gentleman would transfer this money has not been cut. In fact, that subaccount within title I has been level funded so there is no dollar reduction in that program. In fact, the overall title I program, which is directed at improving standards, improving performance on the part of our disadvantaged children has been increased by \$400 million. In fact, we are providing over \$8 billion to deal with the problems of those children. And I am committed to each and every one of those. I have spent my life in this House championing each and every one of them, often over the opposition of a good many Members on the other side of the aisle. I would point out that the gentleman himself voted just 2 years ago to cut title I, the program which is being enhanced by his amendment, he voted to cut it by over \$1 billion.

What I will simply say is that we can do this all day long. But if amendments are adopted on the House floor that savage the President's top two priorities, this bill will not be supported on this side of the aisle and this bill will wind up where apparently a small band of Members on that side of the aisle want to see it. It will be part of a continuing resolution.

I think, substantively, that will be bad for the country, but politically, to be frank about it, it will demonstrate that even after the two parties have made an agreement, that side of the aisle is incapable of living up to that agreement.

I do not think that is in the interest of the gentleman's party or this House or the political system in general.

I also would point out that this bill will not become law and neither will a continuing resolution if the President's priorities are not respected to the same degree that other people's priorities are respected. I would say to those Members of the House in both parties, we have a choice. We can produce a bill which is signable, which is passable

and which will end the wars that have accompanied this bill for the past 2 years.

As we know, this bill was a large part of the reason that the Government was shut down 2 years ago. We can follow that course again or we can try to reach a reasonable compromise between our views. That is what the committee product represents. I think the House ought to stick to that. I would urge rejection of the amendment.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to point out with respect to the ranking member's recollection of my voting record on this particular topic, it is remarkable since 2 years ago I was not a Member of Congress and for me to have voted on that would have been a tremendous achievement, I assure my colleagues.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I stand corrected. I apologize. I was looking at the amendment and I saw the name of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER] on it, who originally intended to offer the amendment. He was here and did so vote. I apologize for a case of mistaken identity.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will always be pleased to be confused with the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER. I am proud of my vote the last time, so I stand here saying that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has worked with us on a number of points, and we appreciate that, but in general, it is easy to talk peace while carrying a sword to some degree.

He knows that in fact we have worked with the President. We have agreed to work and compromise on a number of things in the budget agreement. He admits that he voted against the budget agreement whereas I voted for the budget agreement. So I think it is important in the American people, at least many of the people, there are some who are on the left or the right who have some justifiable criticisms with it but for the most part we are trying to move forward.

When we agreed to the tax cuts in return for the President's spending more money, and presumably spending more money in education and social programs, many of us who were conservatives who had voted in the past to reduce the size of Government in Washington, to cut the spending here and give more power to the people back home, more power to the State governments, local governments, to parents and doing that through tax cuts and through transfer of funds to States with block grants, once we were defeated and the money is going to be spent at the Federal level, which, in ef-

fect, this budget agreement did, we can have a legitimate debate in Congress about how we are going to spend that money in Washington without having and being maligned about us trying to shut down the Federal Government, without us having to hand our voting cards over to the President of the United States and say we just have to take his priorities on education. We can discuss what are the best ways once we are going to spend these dollars at the Federal level on kids without the constant threat that the President is going to veto the bill if we win one vote and shut down the Government because, quite frankly, it is a joint thing when the Government shuts down.

□ 1215

It was not just us so-called radical then-freshmen who shut down the Government. We passed our bills; the President of the United States refused to sign them. We bear joint responsibility when something like that happens.

We need to try to work through this. And this does not mean that we have to roll over and say, oh, we are going to sign off on every priority the President has. As I understand from our negotiators, we did not agree that we were surrendering our right to reshape appropriations bills. What we did agree to is, we are going to put more money into education and youth programs, and we have been trying to do that.

In fact, in title I of this amendment, we tried to move more money to education, because we also said that we did not believe, for example, in increasing OSHA; and then when we increased OSHA, we tried to move it into the compliance section rather than enforcement and administration, and we were defeated on that effort. We were trying to move money into education, and the minority voted against transferring those funds into education. So this is not a battle against transferring funds into education.

Furthermore, we have been constantly maligned in the last few days as to whether we are trying to filibuster. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has been careful not to do that. In this case, he merely said we were offering a series of amendments, and that is true, and I think people are starting to realize that what we are doing is, we are having, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] encouraged us to do that when we were negotiating before these debates started, to have a good and healthy debate for the American people of what are our priorities, where do we think they should go.

Those of us who wanted to cut expenditures and move power back to the States have now, in effect, at least in this Congress, had to back up a step and say, OK, the Federal Government is going to do it. In this case, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, proposing to move money from a program which admittedly does not put

a straitjacket on State and local governments by having Goals 2000, but certainly puts a framework which pushes States toward that, which then puts pressure on the State educational leaders, on the local school boards to say, well, these are the national goals; are we going to be below the national level?

If we would have put in the national history standards, which were an abomination, every school district would have been under tremendous pressure to explain why their standards were not like the "national history standards." That is the danger of something like this, not that there is a straitjacket that forces people to do it, but that momentum overwhelms the ability of local governments to resist it.

On the other hand, in the neglected and high-risk youth, as someone who has worked as the Republican staff director when the Republicans were a minority on the children and family committee, then worked in the Senate with Senator COATS on children and family issues.

Then I have been a member of the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families; I cannot think of a more needed area than to work with these high-risk youth, and that is a better way to target our funds.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, where this money would actually end up under his amendment. It would come out of Goals 2000 and go into this program, but who would actually receive these funds?

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. The dollars are headed to State and local grant-related programs that assist neglected or delinquent children in State-supported institutions, could be correctional facilities or other institutions for neglected and delinquent children.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman, because the way I read the amendment, it would take the money out of Goals 2000 over which local school districts have discretion.

As the gentleman may know, under the Istook amendment, that was adopted in the last year's appropriation, and I think it was a very good amendment. It eliminated the need for States to submit their improvement plans under Goals 2000 to the Secretary of Education, it eliminated the National Education Standards and Improvement Council, it removed the requirement for States to develop opportunity to learn standards, and most importantly, the revision allows the States and localities to use all of their Goals 2000

money for the purchase of technology if they so choose. That seems to me a very high and important priority.

This money, that now could be used by local school districts for education technology needs, is instead going out of the education system, controlled by local school boards; and it is going to go to institutions for juvenile delinquents. It is going to go to adult correctional facilities and institutions for the neglected. In other words, it is going out of the public school system entirely and going for other purposes.

I personally think that the use of the money in Goals 2000, where school districts have a great deal of discretion as to how that money can be used, is a better use of the money than for the Neglected and Delinquent Youth program.

I am not a great fan of Goals 2000, but we spend \$8.2 billion in title I, and this is a title I program. Within title I we spend \$40 million, for neglected and delinquent youth. We are going to put \$40 million more, or double this account, in 1 year under the gentleman's amendment. The gentleman will make it go from \$40 million in the bill to \$80 million in one amendment.

The amendment would double the request of the President of the United States as to what is needed in this account; and very frankly, I would simply rather see this money go to the local school districts and allow them to decide whether they want to use it for education, the Goals 2000 programs, or for educational technology, which many of them do.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman further yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman suggests that the amendment represents dollars going out of school districts entirely toward other types of settings, which I would refute and reject and believe that that cannot be supported.

In fact, this is a grant program. School districts, in many cases and, in fact, in most cases, also apply for these funds, receive these funds for the assistance of at-risk children.

Now, these activities take place in schools of all sorts, and they are at the will and liberty to apply for the grants just as any other institution may. The real question, though, is that we are talking about specific individuals.

Now, while some may measure fairness based on a relationship between institutions, others of us measure fairness on a relationship of how we treat individuals, whether they are a child at risk and subjected and entitled to a public education, be it at an elementary school, be it at a special home that has been created for a neglected or an abused child, or in a juvenile correctional facility. We are talking about dollars that are going directly to children to assist children.

Now, frankly, I am less impressed by how one building or one group of edu-

cation bureaucrats fares compared to another. I think the American people, in general, are more inspired by what we can do for children and for individuals who have the greatest need, who are at the greatest risk.

This amendment, in fact, gets dollars to children who need it most wherever they may be.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PORTER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am not aware that the gentleman, and let me say I share the gentleman's lack of enthusiasm for Goals 2000, but I am not aware that the gentleman has shown any support up till now for the program that he would increase. He did not come to testify before our subcommittee in that regard nor write us regarding this program.

I am not a fan of Goals 2000, but I think the money under Goals 2000 has a great deal more flexibility for use that local school districts would provide. And it seems to me increasing a program that even the President of the United States thinks is fully funded at \$40 million to \$80 million is just not a good concept to follow.

It does not make any sense to me whatsoever, and I would urge the Members to reject the amendment.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully join in the points made by the gentleman from Illinois relative to what happens to the money that is taken out of the Goals 2000 Program and put into the section where the gentleman who offers the amendment would like to have the money put.

I am reading from the law here, which says that the purpose and method of operation of that particular program provides financial assistance to State educational agencies for education services to neglected and delinquent children and youth under age 21 in State-run institutions for juveniles and adult correctional institutions. It says the funds are allocated to the individual States through a formula based on the number of children in State operations and per pupil counts in State institutions that provide at least 20 hours of instruction from non-Federal funds; that adult correctional institutions must provide 15 hours per week.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know of anyone in the Congress that has worked harder over the years to provide money for programs for at-risk, neglected, and delinquent children than I have. I have sat on this subcommittee for more than 20 years urging that we put money into programs that will avoid at-risk children and neglected and delinquent children having to go to State-run institutions and adult correctional institutions.

The money that is being taken out of there, if it were going into a program to help these children avoid becoming at risk and avoid becoming delinquent, it would be the proper way to put the money. But when we look at the Goals 2000 Program, that program is designed so as to keep these children from becoming at risk and becoming children who later on become inmates in State-run institutions and adult correctional institutions.

I think we might just for a moment take a look at what the Goals 2000 Program actually does. This program reflects over a decade of rethinking of American education and how it can be improved. It is one of our best investments because it is aimed at helping all students reach high academic standards and because it offers States, school districts, and schools maximum flexibility in the use of Federal funds to reach this objective.

Goals 2000 also has a tremendous impact because it helps Governors and educators develop the strategic map or planning guide for most effective use of all other resources, Federal, State, and local.

On the contrary, under this other section, where the money is being put, those young people are not helped by the moneys being put there. This money is more designed to carry out the administration of keeping them in these institutions as inmates.

Standards-based reform, which is the purpose of Goals 2000, is working all across the country. Strong schools now, with clear standards of achievement and discipline, are essential to our children and our society. These standards are needed to help instill the skills and encouragement for hard work that our children need to succeed in school and in life. Toward that end we must now establish meaningful standards for what students should be expected to learn and to achieve.

The American public supports high standards in education. Parents deserve to know how their children are performing, based on rigorous standards. And with the help of Goals 2000, States are establishing academic standards and coordinating their curriculum frameworks, student assessment programs, teacher preparation, licensure requirements, parental and community involvement and other aspects of the educational system to help all children achieve the State standard.

So it does not help the young people that the maker of the motion intends to help by taking money out of this type of a program to put it over in a program where these children are the victims then of not having the proper amount of money in those programs and have become delinquent, and as a result of their delinquency become incarcerated in these State institutions and correctional institutions.

So I would hope that the House would reject the gentleman's amendment, because no matter how wellintentioned, it will not achieve what the gentleman

desires to achieve. I think I can say this clearly as one who has fought hard for at-risk youth to try to see that they never have to see what the inside of a State-run institution or what an adult correctional institution is like by having money put in the programs that are designed such as Goals 2000.

□ 1230

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER].

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, rather than ask for an extension of time with the chairman of the subcommittee, I wanted to make a couple of points and then ask a question.

I understood him to say that he felt that the problem of juvenile delinquency was less than the need for the funds for Goals 2000. I want to get that clarified. But that in this amendment as we move to look at the question of national standards, the last speaker said it was not mandatory but that we needed national standards and people were looking for standards. I do not disagree that there needs to be stronger standards in the local schools and at the State level, but we have a fundamental disagreement over whether people are looking to Washington to set standards on anything. We do not have a particularly great record of putting standards on ourselves in this House or in the White House or in the executive agencies on a lot of different things. I do not think parents want to trust us with setting the standards out of here with all the dealmaking that occurs and with all the ability of different lobbying groups to influence it disproportionately here in Washington. I do not think they want the standards coming out of Washington, the involuntary pushing toward this.

On the other side, in the discussion that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] had with the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, the question was, was this money going to the local schools. My understanding is that in Goals 2000, if they agree to cooperate and follow with certain things, some of the money goes there. But in the juvenile delinquency programs, it goes to the States which then move it down to the local level.

Mr. PORTER. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield, let me correct that, because I think the gentleman from Colorado's and the gentleman from Indiana's amendment does not do what they want it to do.

The program that the gentleman mentioned, that is, the program to which the \$40 million would be transferred, is a program that is apportioned to the States. I will read to the gentleman if he wants from the budget justification submitted this year, but let me summarize the first part:

Funds are allocated to the States through a formula based on the number of children in State-operated institutions. . . . Like other

title I programs, this program requires institutions to gear their services to the high State standards that all children are expected to meet. All juvenile facilities may operate institutionwide education programs and use title I funds in combination with other available Federal and State funds.

This is a program for State institutions, not for local school districts, and it is not a grant program.

Mr. SOUDER. It says institutions in the States. It does not necessarily say State institutions.

Mr. PORTER. It says State institutions serving children, "State institutions serving children with an average length of stay of at least 30 days."

Mr. SOUDER. Whether or not, and we can discuss whether State institutions move it to the local level. Let us assume for purposes of debate that we are moving it to the States for neglected children. We attempted in earlier amendments in title I to move money to vocational education for prevention as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES] was referring to, we attempted to move money to IDEA, we will have additional amendments here to try to move it to education programs for high-risk students. This particular amendment is focused on the goals and then moving it to kids. It is hard to say that once somebody is in a juvenile institution that forever they are gone. The purpose of this program and as we reworked the Juvenile Justice Act in the authorizing subcommittee, we tried to look not only at prevention which is important but how we take those kids who are in the system and try to rehabilitate them and work with them while they are in the system. I believe that that ought to be done predominantly at the State level, which these funds do. This moves those funds to the State level. Presumably those State funds and those institutions are at the local community, but let us say that it goes to the State level. I believe that that is much more effective than arbitrary standards set out of Washington in education. That is what this amendment by the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, does.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Let me read from this. I was reading the wrong section. I apologize for that.

This program provides financial assistance to State educational agencies for education services to neglected and delinquent children and youth under age 21 in State-run institutions for juveniles and in adult correctional institutions.

This money will not go to school districts under any circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. I was not maintaining it went to local educational institutions. It went to try to educate people at the local level who are in institutions for juveniles. What I am arguing is that we cannot just say everybody in school is the problem. We also have to try to do literacy courses, vocational education training, and stuff for people who are lost but are coming back out. Juveniles in the system with the exception of those who may have committed a life sentence crime are not going to be there forever. This money moves money for education for those who are in juvenile institutions or adult institutions for training. I believe that is a better use of funds. The gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, proposed this amendment because he believes it is a better use of funds than some sort of Federal standards coming out of Washington that drive our school districts and often override what local school boards or the State institutions in education would favor.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have to say that I am shocked, shocked to hear that all this time we thought that many Members on that side of the table were anti-education when they tried to do away with the Department of Education, never stood up for preventative actions for the criminal justice system before, for juveniles or for anyone else. All of a sudden they have this heartfelt concern for many, many programs that have been fought on that side of the aisle, particularly by that element of the group repeatedly.

I am on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, Mr. Chairman. Believe me, I did not hear any cry for vocational education, asking for more funding at the committee level. In fact, they wanted to zero it out at the committee level. But here we are with an opportunity for them to attack a program that they do not like, and all of a sudden they want vocational education.

If you were sitting in the Committee on the Judiciary, you probably would not hear much from them about preventative programs for juveniles, but here we are with an ability for them to attack a program they do not like and all of a sudden they have a newfound fervor for that.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, if we had sat around for their planning session, what we would have heard is this is an area of Goals 2000 we are going to attack and do it by making some sort of a problem for people by pitting that money against cuts or increases in another area that people feel very strongly about also. They want to be less than disingenuous. If they wanted to be actual and straightforward about it, they would just move to cut the budg-

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. SOUDER. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts suspend?

The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SOUDER. Is it in violation of House rules to malign the motives and try to prescribe motives to people when they have no idea what those motives were?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Indiana making a point of order?

Mr. SOUDER. My point of order is I believe it is a violation of House rules to malign the integrity of other Members and their reasons for offering amendments.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is the gentleman demanding that the gentleman's words be taken down?

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I will take back my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The point of order is withdrawn.

The gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I proceed because I think it is important for the people to know that if it is Goals 2000 about which they want to have the debate, let us have it straightforward on that particular program. This is a program that President Bush put forward with the cooperation of Governors across this Nation, including a then Governor who is now President of the United States. It is a program that virtually every major business group supported, every major educational group supported, people by and large in this country supported because it was not national standards, it was an opportunity to combine Federal resources with local and State resources to establish standards to raise the bar for students across this country, to give them goals to achieve.

That is what we ought to be doing. Then we have to assess where they are. But we need teacher development. Goals 2000 provides the tools to do that. We need to have assessment, and the local communities can do that with the help they get from Goals 2000. We need to have parental involvement, and some communities have taken Goals 2000 grants and done just that, increased parental involvement. These are the programs that we put forward repeatedly, programs that help the public schools in this country improve the ability of the children to learn and give them a chance in this life.

If you do not like Goals 2000, take a straight vote on whether or not to cut that program. But do not try to be disingenuous, do not try and pit one program against another when you have lost the initial debate on policy. Come straight to the people of this country, have the debate, have the vote and then let the House get on with its business.

I commend the chairman and I commend the ranking member for the hard work that they have done in reaching a compromise on a bill that helps to edu-

cate children in this country in what has been by and large historically a nonpartisan venture, the education in the public schools of the children of this country. I ask that we return to that agenda and stop what is going on here.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado Mr. BOB SCHAFFER.

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 31, 1997, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado Mr. BOB SCHAFFER will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. ROEMER

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 22 offered by Mr. ROEMER: Page 64, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

Page 66, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in the spirit of bipartisanship with the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and in the spirit of strong support for our education system and this bipartisan bill that has been put together.

I want to start by commending the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for their hard work in funding particularly a number of programs in education that are important to me. Title I, Head Start and Pell grants are not only fully funded, but we see increases in those very vital programs. I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for their strong work in those areas.

This bipartisan amendment that I offer today is an amendment that would support an innovative, bold, imaginative new idea for public school choice, and that is charter schools.

Where do we get the \$25 million to support charter schools, to take it up from \$75 million in this bill to the President of the United States' request of \$100 million? We take the \$25 million out for charter schools from a program called the technology literacy challenge grant. That is a program that I strongly support. The President asked in that program for \$425 million. The Committee on Appropriations gave it \$460 million, a 130-percent increase. While I strongly support that technology literacy program, our \$25 million taken from that program to put in charter schools will still result in a 112-

percent increase in the technology literacy program, \$10 million above the President's request, and fully fund the charter program that the President has strongly supported.

Why should we be supporting charter schools in this Nation? They are cradles of innovation, they empower teachers and students and parents, they are schools created by teachers, schools and our parents. They are accountable. If a charter school is not working, a charter school can be shut down. They strengthen the public school system. We are not trying to take money away from public schools. We are trying to find bold, new, imaginative programs that give accountability and give access and give local control, and that is a charter school.

These programs, I think, Mr. Chairman, are working. Three years ago, there were two or three charter schools in America. Now there are over 700.

□ 1245

Puerto Rico, District of Columbia, and 30 States have charter schools. They are independent public schools. They are open to all students, they are supported by our tax dollars, they are accountable to citizens, to taxpayers, to parents and to students and to teachers, and they are community-based.

One charter school that I visited here in Washington, DC, is called the Options Charter School. The Options Charter School here in Washington, DC, is not for the elite, it is not for the wealthy, it is 100-percent minority. All the students are eligible for free and reduced lunches, and most of those students have dropped out of the D.C. school system.

So this charter school is not trying to help the elite and the wealthy; it is, in fact, trying to help some of the most disadvantaged students that the D.C. school system is failing.

So let us debunk the myths of charter schools that they are vouchers. No, they strengthen the public school system. Let us debunk the myth that they are for the elite. No, they often serve needy and disabled students. And these are completely accountable because State legislatures have to pass charter school laws.

So I would hope that my colleagues would support a bold and new idea. I would hope my colleagues in the spirit of bipartisanship and the spirit of support for education would bring charter schools up to the President's request of \$100 million, and I would hope that they understand that the money coming out of the Technology Literacy Challenge Grant Program still results, let me remind my colleagues, still results in a 112-percent increase for that Technology Literacy Challenge Grant Program.

Vote for innovation, vote for bipartisanship, vote for charter schools.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, let me explain why. First of all, I think when we are trying to keep an agreement together between the parties, it is important to oppose amendments from both sides of the aisle, not just that side.

Second, I, frankly, do not know quite what I think of the pace at which charter schools ought to be encouraged. I like the idea of charter schools, because I think that they offer an opportunity to escape the bureaucratic box which a lot of local schools have been caught in.

But I am also concerned about the very uneven result we have seen so far with the charter school movement. I think if it is to be developed in the future, it sort of reminds me when we used to be involved, we had a competition between parties, frankly, to show who is most against cancer back 20 years ago. You would have amendment after amendment throwing money very fast into the Cancer Institute. But we did not also add money to the grant overseers in the department to see that the money was not wasted, and a lot of it wound up being wasted and some people went to jail.

I think you can kill a good thing by sometimes increasing its budget too fast, and that is why I am concerned about increasing the funding for charter schools until we have better results.

Third, while that alone would not cause me to oppose the amendment, because I think in the end charter schools will get their problems worked out, I very much am concerned about the source from which the gentleman takes the money, the technology account.

I have had a good many experiences in my district in helping schools on projects in wiring those schools so they can connect with the information highway, in trying to see to it that rural schools, and I do not represent a single city larger than 37,000, I am concerned with seeing that rural schools are not passed by on either the school reform movement or by the technology revolution that is taking place in this country.

It seems to me that this technology account is a key tool in enabling schools with very limited local resources to be able to stay abreast of the breathtaking changes that are occurring in technology and communications around the country.

So that is why I very reluctantly would have to oppose the gentleman's amendment. Perhaps we can reach a different understanding in conference, because the President, I know, is an enthusiast for charter schools, and I am willing to listen to that. But for the moment, again, we have reached an understanding about how these resources ought to be divided.

There is no question that on the merits many accounts in this bill are underfunded. I think this entire bill is underfunded to the tune of at least \$4 to \$5 billion. I think we should be putting

more resources into education, into student aid, into medical research. But until that happens, we have to, unfortunately, make these very hard choices.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to commend the gentleman and Mr. PORTER once again for making some of the tough choices for increasing funding for Head Start, a fantastic program, increasing funding for Pell grants, increasing funding for title I. You have done a great job. I salute the gentleman for that.

I also would agree with the gentleman that the gentleman and I would probably want to take money out of B-2 and space station and put it into education. We do not have that luxury in this bill.

The gentleman's first concern about too much money going into charter schools too quickly, again, I am a supporter of the Technology Literacy Challenge Grant Program. But we have funded that at an 130 percent increase. And even if we are successful in transferring \$25 million, it will still be \$10 million above the President's request. Whereas, if we take the \$25 million and get it into charter schools, we just meet the President's request there.

If this amendment is successful, we have met the President's educational request for charter schools, and we are still \$10 million above his request on the Technology Literacy Challenge Grant Program.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I recognize that. All I would say is there is a reason why technology funding is exploding, and that is because technology itself is exploding, and no school wants to be left behind. This is a crucial time for all of them.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on this amendment, and I am very pleased to join with my good friend and colleague on the Subcommittee on Education and the Workforce, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] in offering and sponsoring this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, 14 years ago the late Terrence Bell, who served as Education Secretary in the Reagan administration, headed up a group that was charged with studying the conditions of American schools. They issued a breakthrough report, a remarkable report, a report that I think to this day is considered somewhat of the definitive study on American education. It was called *A Nation at Risk*.

Now, 14 years later, 1997, another group that Mr. Bell was involved with until he passed away did a followup study called *Reclaiming a Nation at Risk*, and they found that the No. 1 and most important aspect of educational reform is decentralized decisionmaking and site-based management, and that is what charter schools are all about.

They are a remarkable experiment in a highly regulated, very bureaucratic profession, and that is not a slight on teaching, which I consider to be a missionary occupation, but they are a remarkable experiment in decentralization and deregulation.

The early results on charter schools are very, very promising. We have about 600 charter schools in the country today, out of 16,000 primary-secondary schools nationwide, and these charter schools are producing great results.

I personally went to a charter school in southern California called the Vaughn Learning Center, run by a longtime educational administrator, a school administrator, a true professional, an educational entrepreneur I call her, by the name of Dr. Evone Chan.

She started the Vaughn Learning Center in a gang-ridden, poverty-infested area, and has done tremendous things with that particular school. It used to be a neighborhood elementary school. Now it is a charter school.

The kids who lived in that neighborhood who were going to other schools around the city of Los Angeles are back at that charter school, and she has a long waiting list of kids whose families want to send them to the Vaughn Learning Center.

Dr. Chan is very excited about charter schools. She is a tremendous enthusiast for charter schools as being the cutting-edge of public school reform and a way of giving parents more choice in public education.

She told us when we were in Los Angeles having our field hearing on the campus of the Vaughn Learning Center that charter schools were the answer to what she called the three B's, busing, bureaucracy, and butts.

She explained many times throughout her career with the Los Angeles unified school system, she would have a great idea, she, if you will, would promote that idea up the chain of command, up the lines of authority, and get back an answer, "basically that is a great idea, a great suggestion, Dr. Chan, but we can't do it or it won't work for the following reasons."

So she says charter schools are the answers to problems, the busing, bureaucracy, and butts, in education today, and she is joined by a wide number of people, people from across the political spectrum.

Now, the Hudson Institute has also looked at charter schools, Bruno Manno, a senior fellow with the Hudson Institute, visited 50 such schools in 10 States, and concluded, quoting from a Washington Post article, that charter schools may be "the most vibrant force in American education today."

The Department of Education is doing a study on charter schools and they have just finished the first phase of that study. We now know the key findings of that first phase study, the first year report on charter schools, are that educational vision and flexibility from bureaucratic laws and regulations

are the two reasons most commonly cited for starting public charter schools.

Second, they have a racial composition, and this is important to hear, a racial composition similar to statewide averages, or have a higher proportion of minority students.

Third, the Department of Education tells us from their study that they enroll roughly the same proportion of low-income students on average as other public schools.

Last, most charter schools are small, with an average of 275 students, and that provides a tremendous learning environment.

That is why the Hudson Institute found in their report that charter schools are havens for children who have had bad educational experiences elsewhere, low-income children, at-risk children, minority children, and children with learning disabilities and behavioral problems. They and their parents reported they are doing better at their charter schools than at previous schools.

So I support the Roemer amendment and am very pleased to join with the gentleman in commending the amendment to our colleagues.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment. Charter schools can be created by parents, by teachers, by community leaders, by museums, by universities, anyone who is interested in pursuing excellence in education.

Charter schools aim to equip our children with the skills they need to compete in today's ever-expanding global marketplace. A good charter school holds the students to rigorous academic standards and makes excellence the norm.

We are experimenting with charter schools in my State of Connecticut, and these schools create an alternative form of public schooling. For example, in my district, the Odyssey Charter School in Manchester is a middle school that helps underachieving students in traditional subjects like math and English, but also goes on to have these students understand more about communication, newspapers, radio, and the Internet.

Another school that we are beginning is the Sports Science Academy in Hartford, CT. This school has 125 students focusing on careers related to sports industries.

□ 1300

These schools aim to lift restraints on public schools so that all the talent, all the creativity, all the excitement that faculties want so much to bring to a student body can be unleashed. Charter schools can pursue innovative teaching methods that will improve student performance. Designed to deregulate and decentralize education, the charter school concept is intended to empower parents, teachers, and

community members with a flexibility to innovate.

At a time when we are so aware that our students have to grow up and have talent and learn new technological skills, we really have to actively pursue every avenue to make quality education, public education, available. I just think this makes good sense.

Mr. Chairman, my school district in Hartford has some serious, serious problems. All of us who claim to really care about public schools, all of us who really know that what made this country great was our public school system, we really have to think about supporting choice in public schools. If we are going to have choice in public schools, we are going to have to deliver the necessary financial support to charter schools in a way that we demonstrate our commitment.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and thank the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] for bringing this forth. The time has come, and we all say that we are for this, that, or something else, but if we truly believe our public school systems are going to work, then we have to be innovative, and we have to share the cost of that innovation.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Roemer-Riggs amendment. I think it strikes right at the heart of one of the most exciting concepts in education in this country, no matter what part of government we are dealing with. And I have always liked pilot projects, where we test how things work before we nationalize them, or before we make them statewide, or before we bring them into the system.

Charter schools are making a difference in this country. Charter schools are one experiment of the many educational experiments that I think people all over this country are excited about. We should not allow the educational bureaucracy to just allow them to grow very slowly. When we look at the numbers, we heard today that 600 in this country out of 16,000 schools, that is about 3½ percent, are charter schools. That needs to grow.

I, too, am a very strong supporter of the technology literacy fund. But that received a 130 percent increase over last year. It will still have a 110 percent increase. I have heard the words here today several times that you can grow funding for a program too fast and not spend it wisely, and that might be the case here. It will not be underfunded, and it will bring the charter school funding up to what the President felt the needs were. This is one area where the President and I sincerely agree.

All the new research documents show that the reason charter schools are not moving forward faster is the lack of startup funds. That is the role we can play. Even the NEA, I am told, is talking of doing five charter schools. When

the establishment starts to get into the charter school business, it shows us that this is a concept that is making a difference.

In my district, I have a regional charter school proposed that I think is exciting. Small, rural school districts really are challenged to deal with troubled students, students that are truant, students that are in trouble with the law and cause a lot of problems in the school. When there is a certain amount of that, the whole school is disrupted, and the educational process.

We have a regional concept where they are going to hopefully get chartered soon to have, for a multicounty area, a place where troubled students, delinquent children in these small, rural school districts, that could not deal with them in a positive way, a place to offer them a kind of program that would help them, but done on a regional basis.

The grass-roots support continues to grow as people learn about charter schools. In Florida, where independent observers first predicted a relatively small amount of activity due to aspects of the State's enabling legislation, 40 schools were approved in the first two rounds. In North Carolina, more than 60 groups applied for charters in the first round of applications. In Pennsylvania, my State, 90 groups wanted to have a charter school before the law was even passed, and 67 are now receiving State support.

Mr. Chairman, this is an educational experiment that has proven it can make a difference in American schools, all different types of charter schools, and it is one we should force-feed. We should at least fund the President's recommended request of \$100 million, which the Roemer-Riggs amendment does. I think it is one of the best amendments I have seen in the educational debate here.

I urge my colleagues to vote for innovation, to vote for change, to vote for the funding for charter schools that are making a difference, and will make a great difference in this country if we adequately fund them.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on behalf of the Roemer-Riggs amendment, to join my colleagues from the Committee on Education and the Workforce. They seek to put an additional impetus behind this charter school movement. I think it is important.

I come as someone who fully supports free, public, quality education in our country, and I do not think there is anything inconsistent in that in the support of charter schools. They will be and have been, as they have been established throughout the country, public institutions focused on funding through experimentation, and a particular focus on some of the key answers to questions that still challenge the public education system.

In my school district in Philadelphia, the largest in the State of Pennsylvania, our board of education has just approved the application for a number of charters, many of which will be set up in my district, and I am very, very hopeful that not only will it benefit the students who will attend those charter schools, but that there will be lessons learned from them that will be applicable throughout the system.

We need to continue this. As this country goes forward to perfect our Union, nothing has been more important in the American experiment than a free, public, quality education for all of our citizens. So even as those who come to point at some of the difficult and remaining challenges and find some reason to complain about our circumstances in public education, I believe that there is still hope, and I think part of that hope is the charter school effort.

It includes in it still a commitment for a public process, public schooling, and one in which, at least for the charters in Pennsylvania, that the application and enrollment processes are ones in which we can see that there will be a fair opportunity for every young person who wants to participate and be part of those institutions.

I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and his cosponsor, and I would hope this House would favorably support and endorse this amendment. It is unfortunate that we have to move some money from another very worthy program. That is part of a larger debate about what our commitment in this Nation really ought to be in terms of education.

But I am hopeful, even as we take this step, that the technology and literacy program will still have, as has been mentioned by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PETERSON], a colleague of mine, adequate resources and an appropriate increase as we go into the next fiscal year.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to reluctantly oppose this amendment. We have a choice here of two good spending programs in education. I think most Members on both sides of the aisle can support the programs, the charter school program and the technology program. As a member of the subcommittee, we have to make those tough choices, how do you allocate the money.

Charter schools is a new program. We increased it by 50 percent. During hearings this summer, for example, on June 3 we were advised by the chairman of the subcommittee that with respect to charter schools, he said, I am recommending that any funding increase you consider for the Federal charter schools be contingent on enactment of additional authorizing legislation.

There is concern about putting too much money too fast into the program. So we increased it about 50 percent, which is legitimate, and I have already

had the pleasure of visiting two charter schools in my district. I am very, very impressed. They are brand new this year. One is the PAL Program. In fact, I spoke at the opening day ceremonies, along with our State superintendent of schools, Frank Brogan, that our sheriff, Charlie Wells, has used the Police Athletic League to start middle school programs for kids that need special help, not a disciplinary program, but kids that need special learning help, energy and techniques and such, that can help these 100 kids in middle school; a great program. It is really exciting. I was talking to the principal on the phone just yesterday about the benefits of the program.

Another program that I visited last week was Easter Seal, helping disabled kids, again a great idea. I think it is going to be very successful in helping that targeted group of kids that need that special down in Sarasota-Manatee area. I am a supporter of charter schools, and I think maybe Members on both sides of the aisle are.

The technology program is a program that we started to help bring computers in and help us into the 21st century for our schools. Our goal is to have \$2 billion over the next 5 years to help schools get the latest technology, again something we all support. It is a program that we have a goal to reach in 2 years, is the reason this program is increasing, and should continue to increase over this 5-year effort to reach that amount of money.

So charter schools is a good program, and technology is a good program. We can support both of them, but we only have so much money to work with. How do we allocate the dollars? It was the choice of the committee to increase the charter schools by \$25 million. It is not the end of the world if this amendment passes, it is just a matter of making those tough choices.

I think charter schools are an exciting new idea in education. I see it working in the State of Florida. But we have to be careful and let it grow and see how we in Washington can help support the local and State efforts, which of course, is where all control of the educational system should be placed.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. He is a very good friend, and I have certainly enjoyed serving with him on the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to point out to my colleagues, we are talking about increasing funding for charter schools from \$75 to \$100 million, which would fully fund the President's budget request for charter schools. In the hearings we have already conducted in the subcommittee that I chair on primary-secondary education, Early Childhood, Youth and Families, we have heard that the single biggest obstacle to the opening or startup of

more schools is seed capital. That is what we are trying to provide here.

We think we have found a reasonable offset. While I respect the gentleman's views, we think we have found a reasonable offset in the Technology-Literacy Challenge Fund, because that program, that account, received a 130 percent increase in funding, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] pointed out, exceeding the President's request by \$35 million.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] was speaking before the committee, on questioning, he was saying we needed to go slow as far as new authorization. Our reluctance was not to increase it too fast until the authorizing legislation caught up to what is happening in charter schools.

Charter schools is a good idea, but the technology program is something that I think we need to continue to push forward on and achieve that \$2 billion goal. I rise in reluctant opposition.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Riggs-Roemer amendment. I rise in appreciation that these two Members on opposite sides of the aisle have adopted a bipartisan approach to perhaps the most important issue facing our country at this time.

At a time when, on education matters, we are fighting over tests and fighting over vouchers, two Members have anchored us where we all are. They deserve our support and they deserve our appreciation.

They have my particular support because the divisive fight over vouchers has caused unnecessary splits in people who really want the same thing. There is a constitutional issue raised there. There is the fight over diversion of public money. Here is the kind of compromise that can get everybody working together.

In the District last year, when there was a task force appointed by the Speaker to work on school issues for the District, and Representative Steve Gunderson, who has now left the Congress, found that there had been a referendum in the District against vouchers. He looked for an alternative that would accomplish the same thing, and worked with us to get a charter provision in the D.C. appropriation.

Now we see this issue coming alive all over the country. Those who support vouchers tell us existing schools need competition. They could not be more right. Public schools need competition, but I have to tell the Members, they have been getting competition from church schools and from private schools forever. There were those schools there before there were public schools, and they have done nothing to, in fact, improve public schools. The reason is, public schools need to see a public school doing better than they

are doing. That is what a charter school is; it is a public school that is allowed to fly by its own light.

If they see children, just like the children in the public school, going to school on public money, using innovation, you then have real competition. We do not have it from the wonderful parochial schools in my district now. We do not have it from the private schools in my district now. But I can tell the Members, out of the side of their eye, our public schools look at charter schools that are doing better, getting better test scores, and getting better involvement of parents.

The private schools have been there all along. Charter schools are giving a big push to public schools. In my district, we cannot keep up with the number who want public schools.

□ 1315

One hundred million dollars will not begin to do it nationwide. Why should this money be put here? Because there is a market. The market out there in the country is saying: We want these schools, and we ought to respond to that market.

Mr. Chairman, if we want innovation, that is where the innovation is. Vouchers are stuck in the courts and are going to be stuck there for a long time, until the Supreme Court tells us there is a violation of church and State. Meanwhile, all energy, for example in the District of Columbia, is going into public schools, and well it might.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Members, and there are so many now, who are hosting D.C. students as interns in their offices. Many have stopped to tell me how helpful these students are. We want to keep the focus on these public schools; not only on their roofs, but what goes on in these schools.

The District has been chosen out for a possible attachment to its appropriation, imposing a voucher provision on the District, after the District has already said in a public referendum that the District does not want vouchers. This issue held up our appropriation 2 years ago and almost took an insolvent District all the way down.

Mr. Chairman, we know that a voucher provision will be filibustered in the Senate. What a waste of time and energy. Why cause this divisiveness among us on a question of overriding importance to us all, and that is education?

Nobody would filibuster a charter school provision. The overwhelming majority of the public want us to find a quick, nondisruptive way to improve their schools tomorrow, not after the Supreme Court tells us whether or not money can be given to a parochial school or a private school. And, above all, imposing vouchers on a helpless jurisdiction that is not fully represented here, nor in the Senate, is a shameful way.

Mr. Chairman, if the majority thinks that they have a majority for vouchers on the District, then they have a ma-

majority for vouchers in this House. The majority should put their own bill forward, and not bully a smaller jurisdiction.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment and urge its passage.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Roemer-Riggs amendment, and I am very cognizant of the stated concerns of the appropriators. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER] spoke earlier, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] spoke to this as well. I think they raise some legitimate points.

Mr. Chairman, I wish I could say that I was an expert on the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. I know a little bit about it, I think, so it is a good program. I am not quite sure why it is getting the significant increase that it is getting here.

The charter schools is already getting an increase, and this would take it to an additional \$100 million. But I am familiar with the charter schools in my own State. In Delaware, like in other States, we are beginning to innovate and do different things to present a different way of looking at our public schools.

Public school choice, for example, has become a very major issue in just about the last 2 or 3 years in my State, and I think it is a good issue. During the campaign last year, I was actually out at schools having an open house and I never saw such parental interest in a school. It was getting into a choice situation. We are beginning to see real changes.

Mr. Chairman, charter schools invite that. In Delaware, we have charter schools. They tend to be very varying in the kinds of things they are doing. There are not many of them at this point. We certainly need all the guidance, all the innovation, all the research we can get with respect to charter schools, but it is making teachers and administrators and parents and students sit up and say, gee, do I want my child to go to a school of arts? Do I want my child to go to a business or finance school? Do I want my child to do something perhaps different than what the child might be doing otherwise?

Mr. Chairman, the answer in many instances is "Yes." It is breaking the mold. I agree with the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON], because I think we need to do some of this at the public school level, not just at the private school level.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of situation in which we have Federal money as an overlay to what is done at the State and local government level, but I believe that the Federal dollars in this have been well spent. My understanding is that the request of the White House was actually for the amount of money that we are taking

this up to, or something roughly equivalent to it. So I assume that the Department of Education is fully prepared to be able to handle and manage this increase, if we are able to make this change.

So while I have some reluctance to go out of the parameters as set forward by the appropriators, particularly on this very sensitive bill, I think in this instance we would be well-served to help this as the moderate step.

Some people are opposed to vouchers to private schools, and I have mixed feelings about that as well. I think for those who are very interested in vouchers, that this is another offshoot, in a sense, to that; a way of bringing innovation and change to our schools. Mr. Chairman, I would encourage their support for this as well.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Roemer-Riggs amendment, and I congratulate my colleagues on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities for submitting this bipartisan amendment, and urge all Members to look closely at what we are considering here.

We need a more deliberative process and, really, we need a bill out of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, which deals with charter schools in an appropriate fashion. But, Mr. Chairman, in that process there are certain facts we start with. The one gentleman who spoke before said that there are 16,000 schools in the country and about 600 charter schools. The gentleman was not correct. There are 16,000 school districts, approximately, in the country. There are 86,000 schools, approximately, in the country, 86,000 public schools, and only 600 charter schools. According to a study recently released by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, there are 600 charter schools and probably by the end of the year there may be 800 charter schools. So, Mr. Chairman, we might have at the end of this year 800 charter schools out of 86,000.

Mr. Chairman, charter schools are a reasonable experiment. Charter schools represent an approach that has been adopted by a number of different people on both sides of the aisle. Both parties have endorsed charter schools. The President has endorsed charter schools.

We have the National Educational Association and in my State the United Federation of Teachers. There are a number of groups that have endorsed the idea as being no danger to public schools. And, yet, we have only 600 at this point. The experiment will drop off the radar screen if we do not have more just in terms of trying to have an orderly, balanced approach to educational reform.

If we have a good idea, an idea that so many approve of, then why not have it increased to the point where we can study it? We cannot even really study

it, it is so small now, the tiny number of charter schools.

Mr. Chairman, the push is coming from people who are very angry and upset, who will at all cost try to push to get a charter school established and people who want to experiment and get out from under the bureaucracy. But, basically, these people are in the fringes and we need to bring this in and have more groups consider starting charter schools.

Charter schools represent a change in the governance and management of public schools; the governance most of all. The governance is removed from boards of education and big bureaucracies and placed under small groups closer to the school. I do not want it always to be a small group. I do not think only 100- or 200-pupil schools should be charter schools. I think we should have some high schools and we should have some schools that look at the problem of students with discipline problems and really have a board of people from the private sector and education experts, as well as teachers and parents, and come together to try to solve some of these problems that the public schools find intractable. They always complain about disruptive students and where can we put them. Let us have some charter schools to try to attack that problem.

Already, in the area of the technology literacy, we have a substantial amount of money there. I do not like taking money away from that. I am very much a proponent of technology in the schools. We have this week the Congressional Black Caucus, and I have a whole 3-hour forum on technology in the schools bringing together the private sector with the public sector and trying to make it work for the inner-city sector as well as it works in other places.

But, Mr. Chairman, consider the fact that \$2.2 billion a year is to be made available to help this process through the new ruling by the FCC. That is a result of congressional action. When we passed the Telecommunications Act of 1996, we mandated the FCC should develop a way to provide a universal fund for discounted or free service to schools and libraries, and they have done that. I can get a 90 percent discount in most of my district, where we have the poorest children, a 90 percent discount on telecommunication service.

That has given impetus to the development of more and more technology, even in the communities where we have a great deal of poverty. The private sector now is involved not only in my community and my city, but all over the country. So we have a great deal going for telecommunications and for technology. If we take \$25 million from that, it will not slow that down at all.

But, Mr. Chairman, on the other hand, if we do not give charter schools more, they are going to fall off the radar screen. We need a critical mass in order to be able to study what we

are doing. That is all we are asking. Give charter schools a chance. It is a good idea. And if it is a good idea, it deserves the support in an orderly way of the legislators and the people in policy-making positions. It should not be something that gets pushed from the bottom because the public demands it. We have to run to stay ahead of the public in this critical area. So charter schools should be supported with this transfer of funds.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we are hearing another debate on the tough choices that we as Members of Congress have to make. We have had a number throughout this bill where there are two programs that some Members may support or not support, or in fact they may support both of them, then we have to make a priority funding. That is partly why the people elect us and pay us the salaries that we get to make those tough choices.

Mr. Chairman, I am not here to suggest that the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] are part of any scheme to attack technology assistance, just because they favor funding in charter schools. They have made their case that they believe there is enough money in one category and they need to move it into another, and I think it is really unfortunate when people attack the motives of Members of Congress when they try to move money between accounts. We ought to stop that on the House floor.

Mr. Chairman, once we have decided that we are going to spend money in this bill, we have a right to stand up and advocate how we are going to do that.

I am also not suggesting in any way that the gentleman from California or the gentleman from Indiana are any part of a filibuster on this bill. They have a sincere belief that it is important to switch funds, because they believe this area has been underfunded.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with them. I am reluctant. I think the money ought to come out of Goals 2000, a program where we have not seen the success, where it is Federal meddling beyond the point where I think the Federal Government ought to meddle, rather than technology assistance, which I think is a much more defensible program.

But this whole debate is uncomfortable for many of us whose primary goal has been to move the money back to the parents and individuals to make the decisions on education where we believe constitutionally the Founding Fathers wanted it.

Mr. Chairman, that is what we tried to do through the tax cuts. By giving the \$500 credit to parents to make that decision, they now have the choice to use it for health, they can use it for housing, they can use it for clothes or other expenses. But they can use it for

either higher education or private school education.

So, Mr. Chairman, we as part of this whole package, have given parents the flexibility who want to go to, in effect, private schools that would not be eligible under charter school funding or our current education bill.

Mr. Chairman, this addresses another concern, which is what about charter schools to increase competition with public schools? I want to say up front that first off, like I say, I am uncomfortable about moving it from technology assistance, which I believe is a far more deserving program than Goals 2000. At the same time, charter schools are an innovative way to put pressure on the public schools for reform.

In the public schools, however, we cannot abandon those who have been left behind in the public schools, particularly in districts where they do not have the tax support, or handicapped students, which is why we have not been striking at programs that address those areas where schools need the supplemental assistance most in our different amendments and why we have been looking at things like Goals 2000.

Charter schools, however, have been innovative in trying to reach out. Hudson Institute, based in my home State of Indiana, found that 19 percent of the 8,400 students in charter schools they have surveyed had disabilities or impediments affecting their education, indicating that charter schools in fact serve proportionally more disabled students than traditional public schools.

In the Center for Education Reform, the San Diego Chamber of Commerce found that the overall California charter schools enrolled 53 percent minority students. So we are seeing, even in the charter school area, an effort to try to address the highest risk areas where those parents have been left behind. Where higher income people can often go into an alternative school thing, and by Congress giving the tax credit to them we have increased that flexibility, now we need to give more choices to those who may not have that income.

Mr. Chairman, if this amendment passes, I am willing to withdraw my amendment which was to follow, which is to move funds from Goals 2000 to charter schools, because I think it is important that we get the funding in the charter schools. I am disappointed that it would be coming out of technology assistance and computer assistance that I think is far more important than Goals 2000, but I am willing to consider withdrawing my amendment if this amendment looks like it is going to pass.

□ 1330

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I have to say to the gentleman and to the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]

that I am a great fan of charter schools and think they are very, very important.

The only reason that the subcommittee provided less than the President's request was because the gentleman from California, who was a member of our subcommittee and is now the chairman of the relevant authorizing subcommittee, suggested we ought to do so until some changes could be made in the authorizing law.

Now that he is offering the amendment, I guess he is satisfied with the authorizing law. I certainly think that this is the place where the money ought to be, and I would accept the gentleman's amendment and the gentleman from Indiana's amendment at this point.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUDER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Wisconsin that we are delighted with the offer to accept the \$25 million increase in the charter schools. We look forward to working with the gentleman not only in conference but in the years ahead to monitor the charter school program but to also see that it continues to get increases as it performs like the States and the parents and the students want it to perform. So we accept the gentleman's offer.

I think there are two or three more speakers that would just like to speak very briefly in support of the program.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

(Mr. DAVIS of Florida asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, there is no issue that we need to debate on the floor of this House that is more important than improving our schools and understanding our fundamental obligations to stimulate positive reform in our communities and our neighborhoods and in our schools, particularly those reforms that best empower principals and teachers and parents and ultimately students.

As we have talked about this morning, charter schools is an excellent example of that. Thirty States have adopted charter school legislation authorizing the creation of charter schools, including my home State, Florida. In Florida, the law that I helped write struck the balance between assuring a quality education and the protection and safety and well-being of our students while encouraging innovation.

There are five charter schools that have been created so far under that law in the State of Florida, and there are 31 others that are scheduled to open right now.

I think it is significant to point out that of the five schools that have opened, the class size is a lot smaller

than the class size we see around the State in our public schools, averaging about 17 students per class. The students come from very diverse backgrounds. More than half of them have special education needs. What charter schools prove is that there is no greater advocate for our kids at risk than the parents and the teachers that know them, that see them on a daily basis, and principals. These are the people that are creating charter schools. These are the people we are empowering by the adoption of the Riggs-Roemer amendment.

I would like to further add that in an informal survey the parents of the children that are attending the charter schools so far in Florida have said that far more than half of them are doing much better in the charter school setting than they were doing in the traditional school setting. We have had a great start with charter schools, not just in Florida but around the country. I think the House has taken a positive step today by the agreement which I am certain we will follow through on conference to stimulate more positive reform at home with charter schools.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to salute the leadership of the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and certainly my dear friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], and those on the Committee on Appropriations for having the vision and certainly the innovative spirit to recognize the importance and the invaluable work that charter schools are, the invaluable impact, really, that charter schools are having in communities around this Nation.

I certainly thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the leadership on the other side for readily accepting this amendment. But I would say to all of my colleagues, particularly those on the other side of the aisle, that the exuberance and certainly the feeling of victory and triumph that saturates both sides right now, I would hope that we would also pay some close attention to some of the other challenges that many of the school districts in this Nation are facing.

I speak from the Ninth District in Tennessee, Mr. Chairman, where many of our students even today are being let out at noon because they have no air conditioning in their schools. At 7 a.m., classrooms where they are trying to teach algebra and basic English and basic science, the temperature is stifling, 96, 97, and 98 degrees. These are our future leaders, our future public policy leaders, our future pastors, our future policemen and firemen. We owe them what we give really to other issues in our budget, whether it is the B-2 or other expensive items that all of us deem necessary.

I would hope that we would recognize that as we talk about moving this

country into a new millennium, as we talk about taking this Nation from what has been to what can be, that we will invest in those areas which will allow our institutions and our systems to educate our future leaders.

Again, I salute the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] for their leadership, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to hear that this amendment will be accepted. It should be. This is one of the most exciting things that is happening in the area of educational reform. I particularly want to give credit to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], for being in the vanguard of this effort legislatively.

I am the ranking subcommittee Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia. One of the most frustrating things that we have to deal with is the District of Columbia public school system. It may be the worst of any urban area in the country. Even those intimately involved in it will recognize that. But the most exciting thing that is happening within that school system is what is happening in the area of charter schools.

We, in the suburbs, have about 50,000 unfilled jobs. There are at least that many people within the District of Columbia who could be filling those jobs who are not employed. Yet, we cannot make that match.

One of the ways that we are going to attempt to match those jobs with those people who are willing to work and have the basic skills is through the charter school movement, by putting in vocational education, vocational training, bringing in businesses, making the education relevant to the jobs that are available for the graduates.

We had more than 40 good applications for charter schools for the District of Columbia. We cannot possibly fund that many. We will be lucky if we can fund half of the well-qualified ones. This amendment is going to give us more resources so that we can fund more of those excellent efforts at finding ways to get around the institutional orthodoxies, all the institutional structures that mitigate against reform and enabling us to do the right thing for the young people of the District of Columbia.

The District of Columbia is just a microcosm. This is happening all over the country. Every once in a while institutions need to be reformed. We need to bring good innovative ideas in. Think about them for a while, throw them around, see what the effects would be of implementing them, and then, in the case of this idea, we can now imple-

ment it, we can now change the lives of thousands of students around the country and, in many ways, change that whole institutional structure of our public school system so that we are not bound by all those limitations toward excellence in both students, teachers, and administrators.

It is an excellent idea. It is an excellent program. It is an excellent thing that the chairman is doing in accepting this amendment to give us more resources to devote to see to it that these good ideas are actually put into practice where they are needed around the country.

I thank the chairman.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, we will not take up an issue on the floor of this House more important than the one we are debating today—improving the education of our children. I am asking my colleagues to join me today in investing in one of the most promising reforms happening in our country: charter schools. Charter schools are often created by parents, teachers, and communities advocating for the students they care about. These schools often serve as an alternative for at-risk, or special needs children who, for whatever reason, do not perform their best in the traditional public school setting.

We need to have the courage to join these parents and keep these exciting reforms alive. Thirty states, including my home State of Florida, have already passed legislation permitting the establishment of charter schools.

In the Florida law, which I helped write, we struck the balance of protecting students and assuring a sufficient level of quality while allowing innovative teaching. Charter schools have been blossoming all over the State. Thirty-one new charter schools are starting this year in Florida joining the 5 that opened last year.

From Escambia County in Florida's Panhandle to Liberty City in Miami, parents all over Florida are finding out the benefits of charter schools.

Barbara Bowland says Escambia Charter School saved her son from failure. William Allen Reed was in danger of being expelled from high school. After 5 months in charter school, Bowland says Reed was making straight A's and has a brighter future ahead of him.

In my hometown of Tampa, Oscar Wilson decided to put his two children in Eastside Multicultural Community School because the school will give Andrea and Dustin a broader education from different historical perspectives.

Another school opening in Tampa will be started by Metropolitan Ministries which is expected to enroll about 60 kids from kindergarten through the sixth grade. This school will serve children of families living at the nonprofit organization's homeless shelter.

These are just a few of the charter schools giving our children new educational opportunities.

We're learning more and more about this reform movement every day and the benefits students are experiencing. In the five schools that opened last year, the average class size was smaller than most public schools—17 students in each class. That alone thrilled the parents who enrolled their children in charter schools. The schools also attracted students

from diverse backgrounds and more than half had special needs.

An informal survey of parents showed that nearly half the students at these schools who were doing poorly in traditional public schools are now performing at above average levels. I believe one of the main reasons for the success is that these schools are unshackled from the rigid rules and maxims that govern our public school system. Instead, teachers are encouraged to use innovative and creative educational programs to reach these children.

Even though charter schools are one of the fastest growing and most promising education reform efforts in the country today, the current level of funding doesn't even come close to matching the growth. Currently more than 400 charter schools are open across the country, up from only 250 last year. The Riggs-Roemer amendment increases the funding for charter schools from \$75 to \$100 million for fiscal year 1998. The increase will come from a program slated for a 130-percent increase—\$35 million more than President Clinton asked for.

I urge my colleagues to review the facts here. Smaller class sizes, innovative teaching techniques, success from students who never before performed well in school. Do not turn your backs on this opportunity to improve our children's education. Join me in supporting the Riggs-Roemer amendment.

I commend my friends, Mr. ROEMER and Mr. RIGGS for their commitment to our children's future by offering this amendment. This funding will ensure the quality and success of charter schools.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

The amendment was agreed to.

PREFERENTIAL MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California moves that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken, if ordered, on the pending question.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 383]

Abercrombie	Allen	Army
Ackerman	Andrews	Bachus
Aderholt	Archer	Baessler

Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Billbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign

Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Ingليس
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Klecza
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe

Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markley
Martinez
Mascara
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Parker
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall

Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions

Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Soudier
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas

Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 1400

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Four hundred and eleven Members have answered to their name, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. ARMEY was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, in light of the fact that so many Members of this body have members of their family in town for what had been scheduled to be the White House picnic this evening, and even given the fact that the White House has had to cancel the picnic because of the weather circumstances, we believe that we ought to show deference and consideration to those Members who have their families in town, and for that reason, there will be no recorded votes this evening after 6 p.m.

Mr. Chairman, there are two additional points. We would encourage the floor managers of the bill and Members with amendments, if they are able to work out arrangements, to continue work beyond that time to make further progress on the bill in such a way that we might even roll votes until tomorrow morning, to do so if they so desire. But the Members at large should understand that they would not be called back for a vote after 6 p.m.

At the same time, Mr. Chairman, the Speaker has asked that I announce on behalf of the Speaker, myself and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the minority leader, that from 6 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. this evening, there will be a reception/open house held in the Speaker's office and on the Speaker's balcony available to all Members and their guests, hosted by the Speaker, the minority leader and myself. In

the spirit of Hershey, we thought this might be an opportunity for Members and their families to have some time together.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] for a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 40, noes 369, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

AYES—40

Allen	Frank (MA)	Olver
Andrews	Furse	Owens
Bonior	Gejdenson	Pallone
Brown (CA)	Gephardt	Pastor
Conyers	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Coyne	Hinchey	Rodriguez
DeFazio	Hoyer	Slaughter
Delahunt	Johnson, E.B.	Spratt
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Stupak
Dingell	McDermott	Vento
Doggett	McNulty	Waxman
Eshoo	Meehan	Woolsey
Farr	Miller (CA)	
Filner	Mink	

NOES—369

Abercrombie	Chenoweth	Fowler
Ackerman	Christensen	Fox
Aderholt	Clay	Franks (NJ)
Archer	Clayton	Frelinghuysen
Arme	Clement	Frost
Bachus	Clyburn	Gallegly
Baessler	Coble	Ganske
Baldacci	Coburn	Gekas
Ballenger	Collins	Gibbons
Barcia	Combest	Gilchrest
Barr	Condit	Gillmor
Barrett (NE)	Cook	Gilman
Barrett (WI)	Cooksey	Goode
Bartlett	Costello	Goodlatte
Barton	Cox	Goodling
Bass	Cramer	Gordon
Bentsen	Crane	Goss
Bereuter	Crapo	Graham
Berman	Cubin	Granger
Billbray	Cummings	Green
Bilirakis	Cunningham	Greenwood
Bishop	Danner	Gutknecht
Blagojevich	Davis (IL)	Hall (OH)
Bliley	Deal	Hall (TX)
Blumenauer	DeGette	Hamilton
Blunt	DeLay	Hansen
Boehlert	Deutsch	Harman
Boehner	Diaz-Balart	Hastert
Bonilla	Dickey	Hastings (WA)
Bono	Dicks	Hayworth
Borski	Dixon	Hefley
Boswell	Doolittle	Hefner
Boucher	Doyle	Herger
Boyd	Dreier	Hill
Brady	Duncan	Hilleary
Brown (FL)	Dunn	Hilliard
Brown (OH)	Edwards	Hinojosa
Bryant	Ehlers	Hobson
Bunning	Ehrlich	Hoekstra
Burr	Emerson	Holden
Burton	Engel	Hooley
Buyer	Ensign	Horn
Callahan	Etheridge	Hostettler
Calvert	Evans	Houghton
Camp	Everett	Hulshof
Campbell	Ewing	Hunter
Canady	Fattah	Hutchinson
Cannon	Fawell	Hyde
Capps	Flake	Ingليس
Cardin	Foglietta	Istook
Castle	Foley	Jackson (IL)
Chabot	Forbes	Jackson-Lee
Chambliss	Ford	(TX)

Jefferson	Moakley	Scott
Jenkins	Mollohan	Sensenbrenner
John	Moran (KS)	Serrano
Johnson (CT)	Morella	Sessions
Johnson (WI)	Murtha	Shadegg
Johnson, Sam	Myrick	Shaw
Jones	Nadler	Shays
Kanjorski	Neal	Sherman
Kaptur	Nethercutt	Shimkus
Kasich	Neumann	Shuster
Kelly	Ney	Sisisky
Kennedy (MA)	Northup	Skaggs
Kennelly	Norwood	Skeen
Kildee	Nussle	Skelton
Kilpatrick	Oberstar	Smith (MI)
Kim	Obey	Smith (NJ)
Kind (WI)	Ortiz	Smith (OR)
King (NY)	Packard	Smith (TX)
Kingston	Pappas	Smith, Adam
Klecza	Parker	Smith, Linda
Klink	Pascrell	Snowbarger
Klug	Paul	Snyder
Knollenberg	Paxon	Solomon
Kolbe	Payne	Souder
Kucinich	Pease	Spence
LaFalce	Peterson (MN)	Stabenow
LaHood	Peterson (PA)	Stark
Lampson	Petri	Stearns
Lantos	Pickering	Stokes
Largent	Pickett	Strickland
Latham	Pitts	Stump
LaTourette	Pombo	Sununu
Lazio	Pomeroy	Talent
Leach	Porter	Tanner
Levin	Portman	Tauzin
Lewis (CA)	Poshard	Taylor (MS)
Lewis (KY)	Price (NC)	Taylor (NC)
Linder	Pryce (OH)	Thomas
Lipinski	Quinn	Thompson
Livingston	Rahall	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Ramstad	Thune
Lofgren	Rangel	Thurman
Lowey	Redmond	Tiahrt
Lucas	Regula	Tierney
Luther	Reyes	Towns
Maloney (CT)	Riggs	Traficant
Maloney (NY)	Riley	Turner
Manton	Rivers	Upton
Manzullo	Roemer	Velazquez
Markey	Rogan	Visclosky
Martinez	Rogers	Walsh
Mascara	Rohrabacher	Wamp
McCarthy (MO)	Ros-Lehtinen	Waters
McCarthy (NY)	Rothman	Watkins
McCollum	Roukema	Watt (NC)
McCrery	Roybal-Allard	Watts (OK)
McDade	Royce	Weldon (FL)
McGovern	Rush	Weldon (PA)
McHale	Ryun	Weller
McHugh	Sabo	Wexler
McInnis	Salmon	Weygand
McIntosh	Sanchez	White
McIntyre	Sanders	Whitfield
McKeon	Sandlin	Wicker
Meek	Sanford	Wise
Menendez	Sawyer	Wolf
Metcalf	Saxton	Wynn
Mica	Scarborough	Yates
Millender-	Schaefer, Dan	Young (AK)
McDonald	Schaffer, Bob	Young (FL)
Miller (FL)	Schumer	

NOT VOTING—24

Baker	Dooley	Minge
Bateman	English	Moran (VA)
Becerra	Fazio	Oxley
Berry	Gonzalez	Radanovich
Carson	Gutierrez	Schiff
Davis (FL)	Kennedy (RI)	Stenholm
Davis (VA)	Matsui	Tauscher
Dellums	McKinney	Torres

□ 1429

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of the Committee on Appropriations regarding a public awareness program to increase organ donation.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOAKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I would be pleased to engage in a discussion with the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Before I begin, Mr. Chairman, I really would like to compliment the chairman and his committee for bringing to the floor a very, very good bill. The chairman has provided important increases for the National Institutes of Health and other very important programs that will yield important benefits for the health of the Nation. I well understand the benefits of research on hepatitis and liver disease, as well as other areas.

I want to thank the chairman for the NIH increases provided, and the important report language the committee has included in its report providing policy guidance to the NIH on these subjects.

As the chairman well knows, with regard to end-stage liver disease, there is often no other medical option available except transplantation. As of September 3, 1997, just last Wednesday, there were 56,611 people on the United Network for Organ Sharing waiting list. Last year, only 19,000 transplants were performed.

Approximately 3,000 people die each year waiting for an organ. Last year, for example, approximately 800 people died waiting for a liver. The administration recognized the problem of shortages, and requested a \$1.6 million increase for organ donor awareness programs. Regrettably, Mr. Chairman, the House has not been able to provide increased funding for this initiative. Therefore, I would hope that the chairman would look favorably on this item in conference.

Mr. PORTER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for bringing this very important matter to my attention. I want to assure him that I do recognize the importance of expanding the supply of organs, and I want to assure him further that I will look favorably on this item in the conference.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for his outstanding work in this committee and what he has done. I also thank him very much for his response.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his very generous and kind words.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRAHAM

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRAHAM:

Page 64, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$55,000,000)".

Page 64, line 7, after the second dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$55,000,000)".

Page 68, line 17, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$55,000,000)".

Page 68, line 17, after the second dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$55,000,000)".

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would shift \$55 million from the Goals 2000 Program to the IDEA Program. I think a lot has been said about both programs.

I understand that there has been a lot of work going on behind the scenes to try to bring several issues to resolution. I would like for someone, maybe the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], to detail what the agreement is, or the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]. But until we get to that point, let me make a couple of observations about how I feel as an individual Congressman, and I think that feeling is shared by many in this body.

A little bit of history about Goals 2000: It started in the Bush administration with an effort to try to set standards to make us competitive with the Japanese and Germans and other international competitors by having national goals to achieve in education. Unfortunately, every good idea that starts in Washington winds up somewhere a little different than you wanted it to be.

We found that when we try to implement national standards, no matter how noble they are, that the people who implement them have a different view of how the world should work.

I would just make this observation, the Department of Education is in the hands of folks I consider more liberal, more on the liberal side of the House. One day that will probably change, as politics is subject to change. My basic objection is, I do not think we need close to \$400 million to \$500 million in the hands of bureaucrats in Washington to put their personal stamp of approval of how States administer education. The whole idea of the carrot-and-stick approach is a bad idea.

However, we do not get what we want all the time in life. In the 1996 appropriation process, the House had zero dollars for this program; and in fiscal year 1997, we had zero dollars. I think the House spoke very clearly where it felt the \$400 to \$500 million should be spent. It should not be funded through bureaucrats in Washington; it should be spent at home, so people at home can do the best job educating the children. The people at home are the ones that know their names.

However, having said all that, in trying to get through a very tough process, I do believe we have reached an agreement that covers several issues.

I would be glad to yield to the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois, the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. PORTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. Chairman.

I would inform Members that this amendment is the first part of a four-part agreement. This amendment by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] would cut \$55 million from the Goals 2000 Program and transfer that money to the IDEA special education account.

There is a further amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] that is part of the agreement. The agreement also involves the national testing. I agree with the authorizing chairman on this issue. The final part of this agreement is an amendment that will be offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mrs. NORTHUP] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] that affects the part of the bill dealing with whole school reform and comprehensive school reform.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from South Carolina for offering this portion of the amendment. I think we are moving money in the right direction. I am glad we could achieve agreement.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, a question. Does this include the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] regarding the need exchange program?

Mr. PORTER. I do not believe that part is part of this agreement. That will be taken up in order. As the gentleman may know, I am accepting that amendment, but I expect that there will be debate and a vote taken on that separately.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would like to thank the chairman.

A lot of people have worked hard to put this together: Chairman GOODLING, our Education Committee chairman; the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]. But the folks who started this, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SOUDER], the others who spent hours trying to make this bill more acceptable for a lot of people, I want to thank them, because the hours have, I think, resulted in a product that I feel a little better about.

Life is give and take. Sometimes you have to fight for what you want. I think we fought in a very fair, acceptable way that makes the people in America more proud of the House. At least, I would like to think that, anyway.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRAHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman's amendment, and believe because we mandate special education, we have a responsibility to put our money where the mandate is.

Mr. GRAHAM. Chairman GOODLING is one of the reasons we have reached this agreement. I hope people will accept this as being what it is, moving the ball a bit forward, not backward.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] insist on his point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for every Member of the House to understand what is occurring here.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] insist on his point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for every Member to understand what is happening here. This is an amendment which will be the last amendment to cut Goals 2000. This amendment is going to be accepted, most reluctantly accepted, on this side of the aisle, but it is part of an agreement, the other parts of which will follow immediately.

The committee will accept this amendment, further reducing Goals by the amount specified in the amendment. The committee then also plans to accept the Goodling amendment on testing, an amendment which I, for one, am strongly opposed to, but which I think represents the will of the House.

The committee will also accept, as I understand it, the Riggs amendment with respect to eligible IDEA recipients in prison; although, again, there is strong controversy on that question, and it will have to be further resolved in conference.

The committee intends also to then, as I understand it, accept the amendment, and I am not certain who will offer it, the amendment that will change the designation of Whole School Reform to reflect the intent of all sides that this be comprehensive reform. But we do not want to imply what the "Whole School" term seems to imply to some folks.

That represents, basically, the four pieces which will be accepted. It has been agreed that there will be a limitation, as I understand it, of an hour on the discussion of that issue.

I want to make clear, I very strongly personally oppose the idea of accepting the testing amendment. I have very strong reservations about the Riggs amendment, as well. I am certainly not thrilled with the idea of reducing Goals further. But all of these matters are going to have to be worked out between the administration and various groups in the Congress.

I would also say that I think the administration has a good deal of work to do in reaching an understanding on the testing issue with both the majority party and significant elements in the Democratic Caucus as well, and I hope that that can be accomplished. So I want Members to understand that this amendment is being accepted conditionally on our part.

□ 1445

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, how does the gentleman propose to proceed on this? Will there be individually considered amendments or just one?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, yes, Members will be offering their amendments and other Members are free to say or do whatever they want.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, so this will not be a package that the gentleman is accepting in totality?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, again reclaiming my time, as far as we are concerned, this is part of the four-cornered package which the committee has agreed to. Procedurally, we will be required to deal with these issues one at a time, but I wanted the House to know that this is part of an overall agreement that has been reached with much controversy. I expect that even after the House proceeds with it, that there will continue to be much controversy about a number of these items as we move to conference.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me also add my commendation to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for agreeing to this four-part agreement in the education section of this bill.

As the American people who have been tuning in the last few days realize, there has been a substantial debate about the general direction of the funding of these three agencies, the Department of Labor, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Education, and that many of us feel that we need to move that funding out of Washington and into America where it can be put to good uses by the people who need help in these areas.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the authors of this agreement. I think it moves in exactly the right direction. This first amendment to be offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] will take \$55 million from Goals 2000, of which I will speak more later, and move it to the IDEA program which is sorely underfunded.

Then the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] has a reform proposal on IDEA to make that more manageable at the State levels. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] has a wonderful amendment that says no fund shall be used to set up a national standard, which the President has been proposing that we do through the Department of Education and then an outside group. I strongly support that Goodling amendment and do agree that that is the will of the House and should be reflected today in a vote on that.

Then finally the work that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mrs. NORTHUP] has brought to our attention, the whole school reform, and once again we are creating a new program

under that proposal that would have strings attached to \$200 million being sent to the local schools. The gentlewoman worked very hard to bring to the attention of this House the problems with that program, which she knows all too well in her home State of Kentucky. Without the effort of the gentlewoman from Kentucky, frankly, I am not sure we would have reached this agreement.

Ultimately, the people who are the winners out of this type of an agreement are the American people, because we have a better bill. We have had a lot of hard work by Members on both sides of the aisle, and it has been worth the hours that we have spent here debating these issues to reach this point. So I commend, again, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for accepting this agreement on these four amendments.

Now, there will be a couple of additional issues, such as allowing needle exchanges for drug users that Members will want to bring toward the ends of this bill. But I think we will be able to wrap up work fairly expeditiously on this.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, let me address in particular the Graham amendment. It has already been brought out in this House how IDEA has been a terrible mandate on the States, has been underfunded, and that we need to reach that critical 40 percent, something over \$1 billion of Federal money, in order to meet our obligations under that bill here in Congress. This is a beginning toward that step. Fifty-five million dollars will allow us to keep negotiating for more additional funds.

Mr. Chairman, this program is one that is very dear to my heart, because it provides funds to allow disabled children to participate in an educational program that works for them. Some children are brought into the school and mainstreamed into their classroom. Other children have special, unique educational opportunities. This bill deserves funding, so I am very much in favor of this amendment.

In addition, the \$55 million is coming from a program that has been terribly controversial in this country of ours. Goals 2000 has come to stand, for some people, as a Federal effort to teach values that those families do not agree with in our schools. To other people it represents an effort to dummy down the curriculum, to allow students to miss answers on their spelling quizzes and yet still receive a perfect grade because they need to meet these goals.

Mr. Chairman, this is unfortunate because the origin of Goals 2000 was a laudatory goal in increasing the standards of what our young people learn in their education. So I am very pleased that we are able to redirect this \$55 million from Goals 2000 into the very worthy program of IDEA to provide education for disabled students.

Mr. Chairman, we have much more work to do in that area, and I trust

that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] will continue to work through the conference to make sure that this amendment, as well as additional funds for IDEA, are made available, and that the other three amendments will continue to be reflected in the final legislation when it comes back to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words about some report language and then enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. Chairman, let me begin by very much thanking the gentleman from Illinois, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. YOUNG], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and their staffs for all the help that they have provided me in attempting to try to address one of the most important issues facing American veterans and one of the great medical dilemmas facing our country, and that is that over 70,000 Persian Gulf veterans, including hundreds in the State of Vermont, who continue to suffer from Gulf war illness. Mr. Chairman, 6 years after that war's completion, there is still no understanding of the cause of that illness or the development of an effective treatment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS], who is the chairman of the Subcommittee on Human Resources, has held 10 hearings on Gulf war illness since March 1996. As a member of that committee, I cannot begin to express the frustration that many of us feel regarding the ineptitude of the Department of Defense and the VA in responding adequately and effectively to the needs of those veterans who continue to hurt.

Mr. Chairman, pure and simple, the bottom line is that 6 years after the end of the Persian Gulf war, the Department of Defense and the Veterans Administration still have not developed an understanding of the cause of Gulf war illness or an effective treatment protocol. In fact, their record has been so inadequate that last week the Presidential Advisory Committee on Gulf War Illness indicated that it will be recommending to the President that an independent agency outside of the Pentagon take on responsibility for investigating the health effects of low-level chemical and biological weapons exposures.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to inform my colleagues that there is language in the committee report which funds an independent, scientific research program into how chemical exposures in the Persian Gulf relate to the illnesses suffered by as many as 70,000 of our veterans. This research program is to be implemented through the Secretary

of Health with the National Institute of Environmental Health Science as the lead agency.

The committee, as I understand it, has agreed to appropriate \$1.1 million for fiscal year 1998, and has committed to fund this research program at a level of \$7 million over a 5-year period. What is important here is that for the first time a governmental entity outside the Pentagon or the VA will be looking at the role that chemicals may have played in Gulf war illness, and this is a major breakthrough.

Mr. Chairman, this report language is strongly supported by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the National Gulf War Resource Center. Veterans and Americans all over this country, to say the least, are less than impressed by what the DOD and the VA have done and are looking for an alternative methodology for getting some real research into the cause of that terrible problem.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to enter into a colloquy with the chairman of the committee the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Let me begin by saying once again that I would like to thank the gentleman for his cooperation in this important effort. The report language is an important step in the effort to understand the health effects of chemical exposures in the Persian Gulf.

The report language does not address specifically what amount of money is to be appropriated for fiscal year 1998 for this research program. It is my understanding from discussions with the Committee on Appropriations staff that the committee intends that \$1.1 million be spent for this purpose in fiscal year 1998. It is also my understanding that the committee intends that \$7 million be allocated to this program over the next 5 years.

Mr. Chairman, I would like assurances from the gentleman from Illinois that these are the amounts which the Committee on Appropriations is committed to providing.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANDERS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Vermont that the House committee intends that this program be supported in fiscal year 1998 at \$1.1 million, and that the committee intends that this program be supported over the next 5 years at the level of \$7 million.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman from Illinois very much for his help on this important issue, and I thank his staff as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

For carrying out title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and section 418A of the Higher Education Act, \$8,204,217,000, of which \$6,882,616,000 shall become available on July 1, 1998, and shall remain available through September 30, 1999,

and of which \$1,298,386,000 shall become available on October 1, 1998 and shall remain available through September 30, 1999, for academic year 1998-1999: *Provided*, That \$6,191,350,000 shall be available for basic grants under section 1124: *Provided further*, That up to \$3,500,000 of these funds shall be available to the Secretary on October 1, 1997, to obtain updated local-educational-agency-level census poverty data from the Bureau of the Census: *Provided further*, That \$949,249,000 shall be available for concentration grants under section 1124A, \$400,000,000 shall be available for targeted grants under section 1125, \$150,000,000 shall be available under section 1002(g)(2) to demonstrate effective approaches to whole school reform as authorized under section 1502(a)(1)(C), \$10,000,000 shall be available for evaluations under section 1501 and not more than \$7,500,000 shall be reserved for section 1308, of which not more than \$3,000,000 shall be reserved for section 1308(d).

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. RIGGS

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. RIGGS:

On page 65, line 23, strike "whole school reform as authorized under section 1502(a)(1)(C)" and insert in lieu thereof "comprehensive school reform: *Provided* that such approaches show the most promise of enabling children served by Title I to meet challenging State content standards and challenging State student performance standards which shall include an emphasis on basic academics and parental involvement based on proven research and practices";

On page 73, line 19, strike "whole school reform" and insert in lieu thereof "comprehensive school reform: *Provided* that such approaches show the most promise of enabling children to meet challenging State content standards and challenging State student performance standards which shall include an emphasis on basic academics and parental involvement based on proven research and practices";

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order.

Is there objection to the amendments being considered en bloc?

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I believe I just heard the Clerk as she was reading the second amendment, she began the description of the amendment by saying "on page 73, line 19," and the copy of the amendment I have in front of me says "on page 73, line 18."

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to clarify that. Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw my parliamentary inquiry. I am told that the reading Clerk is correct.

Far be it from me to question the work of the wonderful people in the House.

Mr. Chairman, I further ask unanimous consent that all debate on these two amendments, and any amendments to these two amendments, be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between myself and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member of the House Committee on Appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, this pertains to the school reform amendment only?

The CHAIRMAN. Pending amendments and any amendments thereto.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

□ 1500

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, that is the intent of the unanimous consent request that I am offering now, that debate on these two amendments that deal with whole school reform be limited to 1 hour to be equally divided between myself and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to reiterate my understanding of the agreement that resulted from some fairly extensive discussions or negotiations on the House floor today and which I think is attributable to the fine leadership, the bipartisan leadership of the appropriators.

First of all, as we heard just a few moments ago, the first aspect of the agreement was the accepting of the Graham amendment to move \$55 million from Goals 2000 to IDEA, which is a Federal special education program, to IDEA part B.

Second, it is my understanding that at the end of this debate, the appropriators will accept the amendment that I am proposing, joined by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mrs. NORTHUP] and others, changing the legislative language in the bill regarding whole school reform. We will explain that a little bit further here as we get into the debate. And as part of that understanding, I also believe that we on the authorizing committee, led by our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], will be responsible for representing House Republicans during negotiations on this conference report, the Labor, Health

and Human Services, Education appropriations conference report, again, regarding the \$200 million that has been set aside or dedicated in the bill to whole school reform. Again, I point out that we hope that our amendment here that is now pending will modify the definition of whole school reform.

Also, as part of the agreement, Mr. Chairman, I understand, again I am going through this so that our colleagues hear this at least a couple of times and will be aware of what is transpiring on the floor, also as part of this agreement, the bipartisan leadership of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], chairman, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member, will accept the testing limitation amendment to be offered later today or tomorrow by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and they will not oppose a recorded vote on that particular amendment after, obviously, the opportunity to debate the Goodling amendment.

Lastly, as part of this agreement, I understand that my amendment dealing with IDEA special education services for incarcerated individuals, adult prison inmates will also be accepted as part of this agreement. I would be happy to debate that particular amendment if the opportunity presents itself later.

Mr. Chairman, what we are discussing here again is the \$200 million that has been set aside in two different accounts in the bill to fund whole school reform.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman if it is his expectation to have a recorded vote on his IDEA amendment?

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to push for a recorded vote.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIGGS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that this bill appropriates \$200 million to fund whole school reform. Many of us, myself included, as chairman of the authorizing subcommittee, have some concerns about this \$200 million, especially given the fact that no congressional hearings have been held this year on the whole school approach to education reform. We have been hoping for the opportunity which now presents itself in this debate to discuss exactly how that \$200 million would be used to promote school reform and educational improvement at the local level.

We believe very strongly on this side of the aisle that we have to avoid micromanaging in public education.

I understand that whole school reform is designed to promote school reform at the local level based on one of seven approved models and the good work that the new American Schools

Corp. is doing. However, I personally believe that by defining what is a successful school at the Federal level really ignores that most real reform occurs at the local level and, of course, is the prerogative of those locally elected school board members. Those are the locally elected decisionmakers who are closest to the people. They are, obviously, accountable to the people in that community who vote in school board elections. I think we have to resist the temptation to attach strings to money that we provide for education and instead let local experts decide what is best in their community, what will work best in their community.

So we are trying to leave education reform up to the real education experts: States, local leaders, teachers, and parents.

We heard a little bit earlier today about charter school reform and the tremendous strides that are being made in promoting educational progress and improvement in America today through the start up of more charter schools. That is basically because charter schools are all about, as I explained in that debate, decentralization and deregulation.

I also want to add that I believe that the public schools, when deregulated, can compete with the very best private schools. That is also what charter schools are all about. We really do, again, want to respect local control in the longstanding American decision of decentralization of decisionmaking in public education, so instead of forcing taxpayers to fund a program where there may be questions about its success, we really do believe that we should try to make funds available to States and local communities to make better choices about how to improve the education of our children.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] insist on his point of order?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think that there has been a great deal of confusion and misinformation and mischaracterization that has accompanied the debate on this issue. Let me try to walk the House through what in fact the committee is doing with the funding in this bill for this provision. I want to make clear I intend to support the amendment, because I see no difference in the amendment and what our original intentions have been.

Basically, as Members know, this bill has been part of a war zone the past 2 years. It has been one of the key issues, the education issues, the health issues, the labor issues in this bill have been some of the key issues that divided the majority party in the Congress from the White House and that division led to a protracted government shutdown. Because of that fact, we have tried this

year to reach bipartisan agreement on this bill, which is one of the two big gorillas within the appropriations process, the other being the defense bill. We have tried to reach agreement between ourselves on a bipartisan approach so that we do not have a repeat of what happened 2 years ago and last year when we had savage differences of opinion on the bill.

Basically what we agreed is that the priorities of the Republican Party in the House, the priorities of the Democratic Party in the House, and the priorities of the President would all to the best of our abilities be respected and reflected in the bill.

That resulted in a significant increase in funding for the National Institutes of Health. It also resulted in significant increases in funding for school reform. Within the school reform arena, there are some conflicting ideas about how to proceed. The President, for instance, is strongly committed to Goals 2000. He thinks that is the magic answer to school reform. He is committed to testing. He thinks that is a key ingredient of school reform. Members of the House have varying degrees of enthusiasm about either of those approaches.

So we searched for another way to promote reform without getting into an ideological battleground. We came up with this compromise. Basically what we did was to not approve the President's significant increase in Goals 2000. We tried to keep that intact as much as we could, however, in comparison to last year's funding, and we tried to complement that package with another effort at school reform which would devolve most of the decisions back to the local arena.

What we did was to note that a group of very well-known businessmen over the past few years have become increasingly concerned with the failure of a good many public schools to perform the way they wanted them to perform. And because it is, after all, our employers in this country who wind up having to consume, so to speak, the product produced by our local schools when they hire workers that graduate from those schools, they set out to try to determine what could work to make school performance better than it is today. They funded a variety of approaches.

After they had done that for a number of years, they then hired the Rand Corp. to test those various models. They determined that there were six or seven models which they felt showed superior performance in terms of raising student performance.

That is not to say that those are the only models that work. There are many others that are being tried around the country and there are a number of others that seem also to perform rather well.

What they have been asking for the last 3 years is that the Congress help them jump start the school reform movement at the local level. So that is

what we have tried to do. As a result, we have put in this bill the item now before us, a proposal to spend \$200 million so that not just title I schools but all schools who want to experiment at how we improve academic performance can apply for seed money, seed money grants, in order to develop their own plans to reform at the local level.

Now, these reforms are meant to be comprehensive, not single shot. Some people seem to think that the way to deal with school reform is to load up schools with computers or plug into the Internet. Others seem to think we have got to rethink the way we train teachers. Those are all single-shot approaches.

What they have suggested is that we need to enable local school districts to think through how they are going to reform the way they operate in total-ity so that they take a look at the way they are administering schools, the way kids are being taught, the way teachers are being trained, and the way parents and families are being involved in local school decisions.

Despite some of the statements that have been made about this proposal, it has been suggested, for instance, that this is a top to bottom school approach, it is just the opposite. I welcome this amendment because in my view it simply clarifies the original intent of the committee.

What we are trying to do is get decisions not only moved out of Washington to the local district but we are also trying to get schools to operate on the basis of not just how the local superintendent thinks they ought to run but on the basis of how local parents, local faculty, and the community itself thinks they ought to be run. And that is what this is an attempt to do.

Now, it has also been charged that it was the intent of the committee to say that there were only seven models that could be reviewed. That is absolute nonsense. I do not care, and neither does the committee, if the local school districts choose one of the seven models developed by the new American schools movement or if they choose some other model or if they develop their own wrinkle. The only requirement we have in this proposal is that after these schools try whatever reforms are developed at the local level, they have to accept evaluation by somebody besides the people who implemented it so that parents know whether, in fact, there has been an increase in the level of performance. That is exactly what this approach does.

That is why this package has been endorsed by the American Education Research Association, a wide variety of teachers' unions, as well as school administrators, local school board associations, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Association of Title I Directors, the National Parent-Teachers Association, and all the rest, because they recognize that this is an effort to empower local people in local communities to improve

the standards of their schools without taking dictation from either Washington or their local school board.

□ 1515

So I welcome the amendment because it simply clarifies what the intention is.

I would also point out, because some people seem to be seeing ghosts, and I want my colleagues to understand who is the New American Schools group. Their first full-time president was that well-known leftist Ann McLaughlin. She was Ronald Reagan's Secretary of Labor. She was the first full-time president of the organization.

The president of that organization is now David Kearns, who was formerly the chief executive officer of Xerox. In addition, we have Lou Gerstner, who is chairman and CEO of IBM Corp.; and Robert Allen from AT&T; John Clendenin from BellSouth, the chairman and CEO of B.F. Goodrich Co.; the chairman of Honeywell; the chairman of Boeing; the chairman of Lockheed Martin; the chairman of TRW; the chairman of GTE; Paul Tagliabue, the National Football League Commissioner, and others.

This is the supposed left-wing conspiracy that got together and decided that public schools were worth saving and that we needed to base our reforms on hard-headed research, not somebody's ideological ideas, be they right or left, about what might or might not work.

And so it just seems to me that conservatives, liberals, moderates, you name it, all ought to be able to agree that the best way to reform schools is to give people the local resources and the local flexibility to do it. And that is why we did it, so that we could have a constructive alternative to some of the approaches that were polarizing the country.

I want to give my colleagues one example. Bob Slaven, who has developed the model which Johns Hopkins is helping local school districts with around the country, Success For All. He will not even allow the materials for his program to be sent out to any local school district unless they first have broad-based acceptance in the entire community that that is the approach that that local community wants to try.

It is not enough to get the school principal, it is not enough to get a few activist faculty members. They have to have 80-percent agreement from the administrators, 80-percent agreement from the faculty and broad-based community support as well, or he will not even provide his materials to them. He will not even work with them.

So it seems to me that despite people's different sets of concerns, we have arrived at exactly the same place we started. We are putting a key amount of money in a new initiative which originates in the Congress on this end of Pennsylvania Avenue and which demonstrates, I think, that we can

have good ideas about education whether we are in 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue or whether we reside in the Capitol Building or whether we reside in local school districts all throughout the country.

This is the idea behind it. And I think that this language, suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and others, helps us to clarify that, and so I happily accept it. And I think we can get on to discuss our individual philosophies, but in the end, when this funding is adopted, we will strengthen the ability of National Government to do what we do best, not to impose our own judgments but to help local schools develop their own best ideas about how best to educate their kids.

Because in the end I deeply believe that the most important ideas about what happens in education are those that occur at the local level. Parents, teachers, business leaders, students themselves, everyone has a shared responsibility. And what counts is what happens in each individual school because that is where the kids learn, one school at a time, not one State at a time, not on the basis of some nationally imposed prescriptions.

This is simply an effort to help local people develop their own best views about how to achieve a suitable performance.

Mr. Chairman, I insert the following for the RECORD:

CALIFORNIA CONGRESS OF PARENTS,
TEACHERS, AND STUDENTS, INC.,
Los Angeles, CA, September 8, 1997.

Hon. FRANK RIGGS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Re Opposition to proposed amendment of
H.R. 2264.

DEAR MR. RIGGS: I am writing on behalf of the California State PTA to convey our opposition to an amendment that would eliminate "whole school reform" from H.R. 2264, the House Appropriations Committee FY 1998 funding bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. As we understand the proposed amendment, it would remove from the budget the \$200 million now targeted to whole school reform initiatives and redirect this amount to Title I basic grants.

We support the bipartisan proposal by subcommittee chairman John Porter (R-IL) and member Davy Obey (D-WI) to promote educational reform efforts that focus on a whole school. This approach to school improvement brings together parents, teachers, administrators and others in a community to address their school's problems in a way that is comprehensive but specifically tailored to local needs. Many successful models around the country show that whole school reforms do work. This \$200 million is a wise investment and would provide much needed assistance for schools that recognize their problems and are trying to improve.

PTAs in California actively supports the current Title I programs and would enthusiastically support an increased funding allocation for Title I basic grants; but we believe the money should not be taken away from the whole school reform initiative. Providing for these reforms is an important bipartisan effort that would surely increase the effectiveness of Title I programs in helping economically and educationally disadvantaged students to achieve educational success.

In sum, PTA believes an amendment to eliminate the whole school reform initiative is not in the best interests of California's children. We urge you to support the \$200 million education appropriation targeted to whole school reforms.

Thank you for considering our concerns.

Sincerely,
ROSALINE TURNBULL,
President.
ANN DESMOND,
Director of Legislation.
BETTY DEFEN,
Advocate for Federal Legislation.

SEPTEMBER 9, 1997.

Hon. TOM COBURN,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. COBURN: On behalf of the Oklahoma PTA, I am writing to oppose your amendment to H.R. 2264, the House Appropriations Committee FY 1998 funding bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education—that would eliminate funding targeted to whole school reform through Title I and the fund for the Improvement of Education to Title I basic grants.

We realize that effective school reform is very much needed in America and that the Oklahoma's 109,000 PTA members are eager to support an increased funding allocation for Title I basic grants. At this time we are not in agreement to divert monies away from this initiative to spark whole school reform. The initial funding that has been set aside for H.R. 2264 will provide the financial support schools need to implement these whole school reforms and we strongly oppose your amendment to eliminate funding for this purpose.

Sincerely,
LIZ PARKER,
President, Oklahoma PTA.

INDIANA PTA,
Indianapolis, IN, September 9, 1997.

Hon. DAVID MCINTOSH,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am writing to advise you that the Indiana PTA fully supports the bi-partisan support—adopted as part of H.R. 2264, the House Appropriations Committee FY 1998 funding bill for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education—that would direct \$200 million to whole-school reform initiatives.

We understand that you are opposing the whole-school reform initiative part of that bill. While we would fully support additional funding for Title I basic grants, we in Indiana cannot afford to take this money away from whole-school reform.

Effective school reform demands a strong commitment of financial resources and appropriate technical assistance to ensure successful implementation. There are many proven research-based models of effective schools that communities can replicate if they have the tools. The funding that H.R. 2264 sets aside for this purpose would be much needed financial support schools will need to implement whole-school reforms.

The whole-school reform initiative would nicely complement Title I in helping economically and educationally disadvantaged students achieve educational success. We strongly support the \$200 million in supplemental assistance for whole-school reform and encourage you to support it as well.

Indiana's children are depending on you to support all measures that would advance their educations. Thank you for considering this as a priority item for those children.

Sincerely,
DARLENE MALONEY,
President.

INDIANA PTA,

Indianapolis, IN, September 9, 1997.

Hon. MARK SOUDER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: I am writing to advise you that the Indiana PTA fully supports the bi-partisan support—adopted as part of H.R. 2264, the House Appropriations Committee FY 1998 funding bill for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education—that would direct \$200 million to whole-school reform initiatives.

We understand that you are opposing the whole-school reform initiative part of that bill. While we would fully support additional funding for Title I basic grants, we in Indiana cannot afford to take this money away from whole-school reform.

Effective school reform demands a strong commitment of financial resources and appropriate technical assistance to ensure successful implementation. There are many proven research-based models of effective schools that communities can replicate if they have the tools. The funding that H.R. 2264 sets aside for this purpose would be much needed financial support schools will need to implement whole-school reforms.

The whole-school reform initiative would nicely complement Title I in helping economically and educationally disadvantaged students achieve educational success. We strongly support the \$200 million in supplemental assistance for whole-school reform and encourage you to support it as well.

Indiana's children are depending on you to support all measures that would advance their educations. Thank you for considering this as a priority item for those children.

Sincerely,

DARLENE MALONEY,

President.

SEPTEMBER 9, 1997.

Hon. ANNE MEAGHER NORTHUP,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE NORTHUP: I am writing to you to ask for your support in voting against Representative Riggs's amendment to redirect \$200 million from the House Appropriations Committee FY 1998 funding bill for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, H. R. 2264. We know that his amendment is to take this money away from "whole school reform" and put it in Title I funds. We definitely support Title I efforts but feel that school reform is of utmost importance to our state.

In 1990, you were one of a few Republicans that voted for Kentucky Education Reform Act. You felt that a new educational system was exactly what Kentucky needed to move forward in education. It takes money to make sweeping changes in school reform, as you well know by being part of Kentucky's movement in 1990. You have seen vast improvements in Kentucky's education through our new school reform.

Please continue your support for initiatives in whole school reform at the national level. All our children deserve to learn at higher levels and can do so with improvements by each community working together to address the problems schools face in a very comprehensive manner.

Please vote to keep \$200 million for "whole school reform" as a part of H.R. 2262.

Sincerely,

SHARON SOLOMON,

Legislative Chairman, Kentucky PTA.

[The New American Schools Network]

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

GROUNDBREAKING R&D

In five years, New American Schools has developed exciting new designs for effective

schools that enable students to reach high standards. (Most American schools are based on a model designed at the turn of the century.) Working with leading teams of education researchers, teachers, principals, and policymakers, the NAS Design Teams have successfully created models for whole-school improvements.

TESTING DESIGNS IN THE 'REAL WORLD'

We tested our designs in 147 schools and in 19 states to verify, improve, and fine-tune our approaches.

A 1995 analysis by RAND documents New American Schools' successes at the test sites so far. RAND reported that virtually all field-test sites have implemented high academic standards and more in-depth, insightful ways of testing students. In addition, test sites are adopting improved curriculum and teaching strategies, according to RAND, and parent and teacher enthusiasm for these schools continues to grow.

SUCCESS ON A BROAD SCALE

We are currently working with a total of nearly 500 schools in and out of the NAS jurisdictions in ten communities—cities, districts and states—New American Schools is working to bring high performance designs to at least 30 percent of their schools within five years.

LESSONS LEARNED

We consider one of our most important accomplishments to be the knowledge we've collected in five years of developing, testing, and spreading the use of new school designs. The lessons are:

The vision of reform must be clear, shared by school staffs and the communities they serve, and directed at the entire school—not an isolated department or program.

Professional development (training) for teachers and administrators is crucial to successful school improvement and the training must be tied directly to the school vision. But it must be coherent, reinforcing a long-term vision for change and advancing progress toward higher student achievement. New American Schools Design Teams have worked concertedly to eliminate fragmented one-shot training efforts.

One size does not fit all. Communities need a range of tested, research-based options for school improvement. New American Schools' plan to give schools choices among successful reform strategies "is a significant break with some past efforts that sought to impose a single best solution on schools from above," according to RAND.

An investment fund is critical to school transformation. Ultimately, high performance schools will run at the same cost as today's schools, but they require an initial capital investment to jump-start the changes needed. New American Schools estimates that this investment will range from one to two percent of a district's overall budget.

Most schools and districts that have embarked on reform need consistent, ongoing support and assistance from outside organizations with expertise in school improvement.

School change is necessary but not sufficient; school systems must change, too. Teachers, principals, and parents need supportive policies and administrators backing them up.

Teachers can't do it all. Public engagement must be a serious sustained strategy involving parents, students, employers and religious and community leaders if school improvement is to last.

MOUNTING EVIDENCE

No studies have found exactly what makes it possible for children to succeed in school—if there were a single easy answer, it would

have been pursued by now. However, there is mounting evidence that the approaches embodied in the New American Schools designs contain all the elements that state-of-the-art research shows are needed for success.

Two recent reports, in particular, confirm the principles and practices embodied in New American Schools designs:

Successful School Restructuring, a 1995 report by the Center on Organizing and Restructuring of Schools (CORS), and

Schools and Workplaces—An Overview of Successful and Unsuccessful Practices, a 1995 report by the General Accounting Office.

Of course, the most tangible indicators of success come from the schools and communities using our designs.

MORE SPECIFIC ACHIEVEMENTS

New American Schools designs and the communities in which they are working are measuring success in many ways—student test scores, teacher retention, safety and discipline incidents, new practices linked to successful student performance, such as team teaching, active and exciting classrooms, hands-on learning and others.

In a short period of time, New American Schools has generated impressive results.

In many schools using one of the New American Schools designs:

Students are producing higher quality work, achieving at higher levels, and showing improvement on standardized tests and other measures of performance.

Discipline problems are down. Student attendance and engagement are up.

Teacher enthusiasm and community involvement are both on the rise.

Student achievement throughout the school is improving quicker than conventional wisdom suggests is possible.

A few examples of real results so far:

In pilot schools using the Roots and Wings design, third-graders' scores on the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program rose in language, math, and science.

Fourth-graders in a Co-NECT school made significant gains on a Massachusetts statewide test compared to two years earlier.

The proportion of third-graders demonstrating essential skills rose from 22 percent to 50 percent in reading, and from 48 percent to 82 percent in math at a school in the South Bronx using the Modern Red Schoolhouse design.

New American Schools Working Towards Excellence: Early Indicators from Schools Implementing New American Schools Designs covers the latest results available on all seven designs.

Some schools will not see test scores rise this quickly. New American Schools believes, however, that quantifiable increases in student performance are among the most important indicators of success, and we will insist on accountability in this area.

DEMONSTRATING PROGRESS—PROFILES OF EXEMPLARY SCHOOLS USING NAS WHOLE SCHOOL DESIGNS, SEPTEMBER 8, 1997

AUDREY COHEN COLLEGE SCHOOL

The Audrey Cohen College system of education focuses student learning on the study and achievement of meaningful "purposes" for each semester's academic goals. In fourth grade, for examples, one purpose is "we work for good health." Students achieve their purpose by using their knowledge and skills to plan, carry out, and evaluate a constructive action to benefit the community and the larger world. The design emphasizes strong leadership among administrators, teachers, parents, students and community members.

Number of schools: 21.

Locations: Dade County, Florida; Hollandale, Mississippi; Memphis; Phoenix; San Diego; Seattle.

For More Information: contact Janith Jordan, (212) 343-1234 ext. 3400; email: JanithJ@aol.com; www.audrey-cohen.edu.

Simmons Elementary School, Hollandale, MS

For six years, Simmons Elementary School has been an Audrey Cohen College school. Students monitor their own progress as they increasingly assume responsibility for their learning.

Each student is assessed to see how well he or she understands academic content and to determine their ability to use knowledge and skills with increasing sophistication to achieve the overarching purpose of the academic plan. Under the Audrey Cohen whole school design, students achieve a meaningful purpose each semester by planning, carrying out, and evaluating a "Constructive Action" in which they use their knowledge and skills to benefit their community and the larger world. In using what they know and applying what they learn, students not only achieve a meaningful Purpose, but they also learn to be effective and caring citizens able to manage their lives and help to make the world a better place to live. For example, sixth graders at Simmons Elementary School recognized the need for more community planning. They met with university, business, and government officials to initiate work on a strategic plan for economic and community development. Subsequently, they participated in the actual community planning.

As a result of this approach, students at Simmons Elementary made gains in Reading, Mathematics, and Language on the state's test of academic skills between 1994 and 1995, and these gains were sustained on the most recent 1996 results. By 1996, fifth grade students at Simmons ranked third in the state in Language, ninth in Reading, and sixteenth in Mathematics out of 153 schools measured. Simmons has been featured in the Memphis Commercial Appeal as a "success story" and the Superintendent cited for leading the way in showing what quality public education can be. The Superintendent credits the Audrey Cohen approach called "Purpose-Centered Education" for the district's current success.

Louisa May Alcott Elementary School, San Diego, CA

"My husband and I learned first-hand that in many areas—math, computer technology, reading comprehension, and most important, the teaching of respect for oneself and others—this school far exceeds the two private schools we tried. I have seen the strength of the Purpose-Centered curriculum and staff."—Louisa May Alcott Elementary, School Parent

"We introduced the College's Purpose Centered Education in our elementary school five years ago and the results have been incredible. The evidence is varied and is visible not just in the excitement and new culture of the school but throughout the community."—Principal

Louisa May Alcott Elementary School in San Diego has been using Audrey Cohen's Purpose-Centered school design since 1991-92. Over the past six years, the community has been actively involved with the College's system of education through a growing number of community members serving as Purpose Experts and community businesses and organizations serving as sites for Purpose Trips.

School-wide activities developed by students have been effective in sustaining and increasing student achievement gains. Through the years, the school has maintained or improved its above-average scores in Reading and Mathematics. Constructive Actions being developed at the school are creative and far reaching. For example, through the Internet, students learned that

foundations offer help to people who are suffering. The students decided to find a way to use technology as a communications device in order to rally people from all walks of life around individuals in need. This activity enabled students to become familiar with various technologies, including the Internet, for sharing information. Students were able to understand how distant communities can be linked by sharing information around subjects of interest and concern to all.

Students at Louisa May Alcott Elementary School also planned and conducted a full-blown health conference, with exhibits, demonstrations, activities, materials and services such as blood pressure readings, to inform community decision-makers about health issues that they thought were not being addressed. Through the local news media, the class also took a position against proposed cuts in the local Health Department budget.

EXPEDITIONARY LEARNING OUTWARD BOUND USA

Built on the 10 Outward Bound principles, Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound operates on the belief that learning is an expedition into the unknown. Expeditionary learning draws on the power of purposeful, intellectual investigations—called learning expeditions—to improve student achievement and build character. Learning expeditions are long-term, academically rigorous, interdisciplinary studies that require students to work inside and outside the classroom. In Expeditionary Learning schools, students and teachers stay together for more than one year, teachers work collaboratively through team teaching and shared planning, and there is no tracking.

Number of Schools: 53

Locations: Baltimore County, Maryland; Boston; Cincinnati; Dade County, Florida; Decatur, Georgia; Denver; Dubuque, Iowa; Portland, Maine; Memphis; New York City; San Antonio

For More Information: contact Amy Mednick, (617) 576-1260 ext. 17; email: info@elob.ednet <http://hugsel.harvard.edu/~elob>

King Middle School, Portland, ME

King Middle School's students include a growing number of immigrants who speak as many as 28 different languages. Nonetheless, the school went from being below the state average in all curriculum areas in 1994-95 to being above the state average in six out of seven areas in 1995-96. As a result, principal Mike McCarthy was selected as Maine Principal of the Year.

King faculty have developed a shared understanding of effective middle level education grounded in core principles: active learning in thematic, project-based learning expeditions that have meaning and purpose; sharing student work with authentic audiences beyond the classroom; heterogeneous grouping and instructional practices that incorporate multiple learning styles; multi-disciplinary team teaching; cooperative learning; and high expectations that each and every student is capable of high achievement and high quality work. Through ongoing conversations, there is a shared vision of whole school change focused on a common set of design principles.

All teachers plan and teach in teams, and team planning time is built into the school schedule. Staff development workshops are held weekly after school on issues related to school improvement and implementation of Expeditionary Learning. The school is divided into two houses to promote and foster effective student teams. All students stay with the same team of teachers for two years in order to foster a sense of belonging among both students and teachers and to create the stability and familiarity of a long-term rela-

tionship between students, teachers, and parents.

Every learning expedition ends with students sharing work with an audience beyond the classroom, enhancing the sense of purpose and belonging. For example, students published a professional quality field guide to intertidal life in Casco Bay and presented their design plans for a Portland Aquarium to architects and the Portland Museum Design Committee. Both the nature of the tasks and the public demonstration constitute real world assessment that foster high quality student work. The school held a two day fair where community members, parents, and teachers from other schools were invited to see a gallery of student work from learning expeditions.

King School has developed a core curriculum aligned with Maine educational standards that is the focus of learning expeditions. Learning expeditions provide a highly effective means to address the learning needs and styles of a diverse group of learners in heterogeneous classrooms. Learning expeditions challenge and support each student to do his or her best, using multiple voices and media, and then to better their personal best. The ability to translate state learning standards into an effective curriculum and instructional practices was demonstrated by performance of King students on the Maine Educational Assessment, which focuses on critical thinking and higher order thinking skills.

Rocky Mountain School of Expeditionary Learning (RMSEL), Denver, CO

"The Rocky Mountain School of Expeditionary Learning is well on its way to becoming a powerful example of educational practice for the state of Colorado and the nation. We were greatly impressed with the level of commitment, respect, and thought about learning that both students and teachers demonstrated during our visit. Nearly every student interviewed by the visiting team could articulate what they were learning and where they were going. We saw much evidence of Expeditionary Learning Design Principles in action. RMSEL is helping students overcome fear and apathy while 'allowing them to discover that everyone has much more in them than they think.' It is clear that RMSEL is a thoughtful, caring and respectful community of educators. We look forward to following the school's progress."—From the Report of the Visit of the North Central Association (NCA) Visiting Resource Team (April 1997)

Through an ongoing series of task forces, whole school planning meetings, and reflection, the Rocky Mountain school's faculty and parents have developed and are continuously improving "rubrics" for student work for scientific reasoning (science and technology), quantitative reasoning (math), cultural understanding (social studies), language arts, writing, and arts, literature, and aesthetics. Led by the Portfolio Committee, the school structure focused discussions of student work in teacher teams and in classes with students, and developing a school-wide assessment plan.

The school has set aside one staff meeting each month to fine-tune rubrics, and to think about what they value in student work in various domains and how to capture those criteria in rubrics. Additional staff meetings are devoted to sharing and giving feedback on learning expeditions. Assessment of student work with rubrics is used in developing learning expeditions and thinking about the qualities of culminating projects and exhibitions.

The school has developed an authentic graduation requirement and "rites of passage" (graduation performances) for grades

2, 5, 8, and 12 based on portfolios and a demonstration of what students know and are able to do. The process of developing graduation requirements began with a three day retreat where teachers, parents, and students developed a draft for discussion within the school community. The graduation requirement and rites of passage integrate the major academic disciplines with experiential learning, intellectual rigor, reflection, service, and adventure. To demonstrate that the graduate has both a well developed intellect and character, he or she must present ten portfolios and a senior exhibition project to the graduation committee.

RMSEL makes service learning an important and formal part of their educational focus. As part of the graduation requirement, students must submit a Service Portfolio that contains (1) a formal resume of the student's community service work that is viewed as being significant to the community and relevant letters of reference from supervisors or organizers; (2) a major service project that is presented in the form of an essay, video, or oral presentation; and (3) evidence of service to the school.

MODERN RED SCHOOL HOUSE

This design strives to help all students achieve high standards through the construction of a standards-driven curriculum; employment of traditional and performance-based assessments; effective organizational patterns and professional-development programs; and implementations of effective community-involvement strategies. Students master a rigorous curriculum designed to transmit common culture, develop character, and promote the principles of democratic government.

Number of Schools: 52

Locations: Columbus, Beech Grove, and Greentown, Indiana; Dade County, Florida; Franklin and Lawrence, Massachusetts; Illinois; Indianapolis; Kayenta, Arizona; Memphis; New York City; Philadelphia; San Antonio

For More Information: contact June Gregory, (888) 275-6774; email: skilgore@mrsch.org; http://www.mrsh.org

Robert Frost Elementary School, Indianapolis, IN

Since Fall 1993, Robert Frost Elementary School has implemented most aspects of the Modern Red Schoolhouse Design. Classes have been redesigned to promote continuous student progress toward standards in a multi-age, multi-year setting. Core Knowledge is used as the foundation for teacher-developed units that are linked to the modern Red Schoolhouse standards. An instructional management team meets with the principal weekly to design and modify instructional practice, technology use, design implementation, and budget plans. This team also works to write grant proposals and to organize extended learning opportunities.

Test scores on the standardized NCE test given to fifth graders improved across the board in the 1996-97 year. Scores for fifth graders rose 12 points in reading, 12 points in math, and 10 points in language over the 1995-96 scores. Robert Frost Elementary achieved 100 percent participation in parent conferences in both the 1995-96 and the 1996-97 school years and its accountability plan is being used as a model for all Indianapolis Public Schools.

Treasure Island Elementary School, North Bay Village, FL

Treasure Island Elementary also uses the Modern Red School House design to focus on high academic achievement for all students. According to the approach taken by the school all children can learn and attain high standards but vary in the time they need to

learn and the ways they learn best. To accommodate the varying needs of children, the school introduced 13 after-school classes which are attended voluntarily by over 20 percent of students at the school. These classes include both enrichment and support topics such as Creative Writing, Math-Manipulatives, and Spanish Literature. To help students concerned with their test taking skills, the school also implemented a Saturday Academy focused on following directions during a test and managing time during a test.

Treasure Island has developed block scheduling for staff in order to allow them one hour of grade level planning time every day to be used either for grade level teams or for personal planning time.

Modern Red has helped to clarify and target Treasure Island's focus—organizing instruction to meet the needs of all students. By reallocating funds from a variety of sources (Title I, grant monies, and instructional funds), they have been able to improve both the content and the delivery of curriculum.

Results have been impressive. Students have increased their reading comprehension, mathematics computation scores, mathematics applications, and science scores each year. Scores in reading comprehension are up four percent since last year. Mathematics computation and mathematics application scores are up 15 percent and 7 percent, respectively. Science scores increased 11 percent.

CO-NECT

Assisting schools in creating and managing their own high-tech equipment and network, Co-NECT uses technology to enhance every aspect of teaching, learning, professional development, and school management. Co-NECT Schools are organized around small clusters of students who are taught by a cross-disciplinary team. Most students stay in the same cluster with the same teachers for at least two years. Teaching and learning center on interdisciplinary projects that promote critical skills and academic understanding. A team of educators and parents set school goals.

Number of Schools: 78

Locations: Cincinnati; Dade County, Florida; Juneau, Alaska; Memphis; Philadelphia; San Antonio; Worcester, Massachusetts

For More Information: contact Diana Nunnaley, (617) 873-2683; email: infoconnect.bbn.com http://co-nect.bbn.com

Oak Forest Elementary School, Memphis, TN

Oak Forest Elementary School, located on the outskirts of Memphis, Tennessee, has been working with Co-NECT since 1995. The school lab, greenhouse, computer lab, multipurpose room, story-telling room, library/media center, and music rooms.

The school has had a strong commitment to technology since its opening in the fall of 1993. It is one of twenty-four Memphis City Century Classroom Program. Every classroom in grades 4-6 has a minimum of three fully-equipped technology stations, and one teacher workstation with a large-screen display, laser disc player, and VCR. Every classroom in grades K-3 has at least one computer. Every classroom is connected to the Internet.

Some 32 classroom teachers in grades K-6 are teamed in clusters of three to four classes, representing different grades and ages. The cluster studies the same topic, with each class investigating a different question related to that topic. For example, if the topic is North America, one class may study North American birds, another may study the different cultures, while another may elect to study folk tales. As a way of keeping teachers with the same group of students for more

than one year, some teachers "loop" with their classes—teaching, for example, 4th grade one year and 5th grade the next.

In recent years, teachers have become increasingly adept at using technology to enrich and extend curriculum projects. For examples, using the Internet, students have collected data on acid rain from other students in California, New York, Illinois, Germany, Japan, and Russia. They used a spreadsheet program to organize the data and create graphs and charts, then presented their findings using HyperCard.

Campbell Drive Middle School, Homestead, FL

In the spring of 1996-1997, Campbell Drive Middle School, a Co-NECT School in Dade County, Florida, reported test score gains in several critical areas, including writing, reading comprehension, science, and mathematics.

Most impressively, the percentage of students scoring "3.0" or higher on Florida Writes!, the state writing assessment, is now up to 72 percent approaching the district average, marking the third year in a row of continuing improvement.

PERCENTAGE SCORING 3.0 OR BETTER ON FLORIDA WRITING ASSESSMENT

	1993-94	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97
Dade County Public Schools	45	66	84	80
Campbell Drive Middle School	14	52	67	72

These results are especially impressive in a year when scores on the state writing assessment have dropped district wide. In fact, Campbell Drive was the only school in Region IV to show improvement, and was the second most improved middle school in Dade County. Scores on the Stanford Achievement Test were also up in science (grade 8), reading comprehension (grade 8), and math applications (both grade 7 and grade 8).

Principal Santiago Corrada credits the hard work of this teaching staff and students for these improvements. "We've had a banner year," he says, "and although we still have room for improvement, we're rapidly becoming the premier middle school in South Dade."

The school has recently organized a "Tech Squad" to help train other students how to use various software applications as well as help maintain the school's web site. The squad is made up of nine students trained by four Campbell Drive teachers. The students have learned how to use scanners and QuickTake cameras. After learning various technologies, the squad ventures into classrooms to help train teachers and fellow students.

Located in Homestead, Florida, Campbell Drive Middle School serves a student population that is 54 percent Hispanic, 34 percent African-American, and 10 percent White. In 1995-1996, approximately 83 percent received free or reduced lunch, and 8 percent were classified as having Limited English Proficiency. Many are children of migrant workers. The school has been a Co-NECT School since 1995-1996.

ATLAS COMMUNITIES

The ATLAS design centers on pathways—groups of schools made up of high schools and elementary and middle schools that feed into them. Teams of teachers from each pathway work together to design curriculum and assessments based on locally defined standards. Teachers collaborate with parents and administrators to form a learning community that works together to set and maintain sound management policies.

Number of Schools: 52 (10 pathways)

Locations: Gorham, Maine; Memphis; Norfolk, Virginia; Philadelphia; Prince George's County, Maryland; Seattle

For More Information: contact Jane Feinberg, (617) 969-7100, email: Atlas@edc.org <http://www.edc.org/FSC/ATLAS>

The Booker T. Washington High School, Memphis, TN

In 1989, Principal Elsie Lewis Bailey joined The Booker T. Washington High School in Memphis, TN as an assistant principal. Her appointment was part of the city's "de-regulation" experiment, which gave schools in close proximity to public housing and opportunity to interview only those staff who chose to be there. As a result, "the turmoil was gone, but the academics were still very poor."

As principal, Bailey began to lay the groundwork for changes in curriculum and teaching practice. A colleague in Texas had helped her implement block scheduling. The school also formed curriculum committees, readying her staff for conversations around education reform. "If you don't have or develop a site-based framework, ATLAS won't work," commented Bailey.

After two years with ATLAS, Bailey reported that the school has incorporated pieces of the ATLAS design in phases. During the first year she spent much of her time working closely with the "resistors to change." It was not until the next year when she visited the elementary and middle schools in the pathway that, "the light bulb went off in my head. Atlas is not going to make us change. ATLAS is a framework—we decide how we're going to do it."

Bailey spoke of the deep impact of ATLAS on the students at Booker T. Washington. A peer mediation program is in full force. All student work is expected to be typed. The school just finished its first pilot year doing Exhibitions, a milestone considering that students in the school thought they were incapable of such work. The school has also implemented full inclusion. She mentioned one student whose state test score went from 49 to 85 after inclusion. "We've got to stop labeling kids. Our children lack experiences. If you've never seen a mountain, you can't talk about it."

Mason Elementary School, Boston, MA

In 1991, the Boston Herald called the Mason Elementary School the "least chosen" of 120 schools in Boston. Enrollment at Mason Elementary School was at an all-time low in 1991. The building was falling apart. Retention between first and second grade was 30 percent. Special education referrals were in the double digits. Reading scores were in the lowest quartile. The school offered no psychological services and no extended hours. Parent involvement was minimal at best.

In five years, Mason Elementary has been transformed. Now one of Boston's "overchosen" schools, Mason is bursting at the seams with students. Enrollment is 11 percent above capacity. The school has undergone renovations worth \$1.5 million. Special Education referrals have fallen to six percent, while test scores have moved to the upper quartile. In addition, more than 90 percent of the parents are involved in the school and volunteer hours have soared from 30 in 1991 to 600 in 1996.

ROOTS & WINGS

This elementary school design builds on the widely used Success for All reading program and incorporates science, history, and mathematics to achieve a comprehensive academic program. The premise of the design is that schools must do whatever it takes to make sure all students succeed. To this end, Roots and Wings schools provide at-risk students with tutors, family support, and a variety of other services aimed at eliminating obstacles to success.

Number of Schools: 236

Locations: Anson County, North Carolina; Asbury Park, New Jersey; Cincinnati, Elyria, and Dawson-Bryant, Ohio; Columbus, Indiana; Dade County, Palm Beach County, and Putnam County, Florida; Everett, Washington; Flint Michigan; Henry County and Memphis, Tennessee; Houston; Aldine, Morton, Muleshore, San Antonio, Texas; Mesa and Lueppe, Arizona; Modesto, Pasadena, and Riverside, California; Brooklyn, New York; Philadelphia and Johnstown, Pennsylvania; Rockford, Illinois; St. Mary's County and Baltimore County, Maryland

For More Information: contact Dr. Robert Slavin, (410) 516-0274; email: rsllavin@inet.ed.gov <http://scov.csos.jhu.edu/sfa>

Lackland City Elementary School, San Antonio, TX

Lackland City Elementary School began working with the Success for All component of Roots & Wings in the fall of 1994. The reading program was successfully implemented at all grade levels and a special effort was made to ensure that all students had opportunities to take books home to read. Additional support was provided for reading by having older students listen to younger students read during breakfast served to most students in the school through federal funds. The school added its family support component in 1994 and began implementation of Math Wings in third, fourth, and fifth grades in the fall of 1996. The school's focus on community involvement has led to partnerships with local agencies. For example, Santa Rosa Hospital provides a weekly immunizations clinic at the school, as well as WIC program services.

Since implementing Roots & Wings, 84 percent of students at Lackland Elementary are achieving the grade level objectives in reading on the Texas statewide assessment (TAAS). On the mathematics TAAS, eighty-five percent of the students achieved grade level—an increase of 35 points over the previous year when the school began implementation of Math Wings. All students read a book of their choice at home each night and virtually every single parent reports that they listen to or discuss what their children are reading and sign a "reading response" form each week.

El Vista Elementary School, Modesto, CA

El Vista Elementary School has been working with the Roots & Wings design since 1993. All of the elements of the reading program, Success for All, have been fully implemented throughout the school since 1991. Additionally, one of the other key elements of the design, Math Wings was implemented in grades 3, 4, and 5 during the 1995-96 school year. El Vista has a very strong Family Support Team, which has developed a wide variety of strategies for helping parents read to their children. The teachers at El Vista are very active in the development of specific classroom materials to enhance their implementation of Roots & Wings components.

Since 1992, achievement levels for all first graders have been tracked until the students finish third grade. Of the students tracked, only two were below grade level at the end of the third grade. Discipline problems are down and students are actively involved in the school and in each other's success. After only one year in Math Wings, total math scores on the California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) had increased by 2.5 points among third graders, 6.2 points among fourth graders, and 8.6 points among fifth graders at the school.

NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR RESTRUCTURING EDUCATION (NARE)

This partnership of schools, districts, states, and leading national organizations

works to change the education system from classroom to statewide through a five-point set of priorities. Known as "design tasks," they are: standards and assessments, learning environments, high-performance management, community services and supports, and public engagement. The National Alliance provides extensive training and materials in each area.

Number of Schools: 218

Locations: Arkansas; Chicago; Kentucky; Pittsburgh and the Milton Hershey School, Hershey, Pennsylvania; Rochester and White Plains, New York; San Diego; Washington

For More Information: contact Zenette Duffy or Dr. Mary Anne Mays, (202) 783-3668; email: nareinfo@ncee.org; <http://www.ncee.org/OurPrograms/narePage.html>

John F. Kennedy Elementary School, Louisville, KY

Once known for all the wrong reasons, John F. Kennedy Elementary School has improved student performance remarkably over the past five years and has earned national acclaim for doing something right. Performance in reading and math tripled; performance in writing quadrupled; and scores in science and social studies were twice what they were. In 1996 the school's principal, who was once summoned to the superintendent's office to explain a high kindergarten failure rate, received the Milken Family Foundation Award.

JFK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PROGRESS ON STATE ASSESSMENTS SINCE PARTICIPATING IN NARE

Subject	1991-92	1992-93	1993-94	1994-95
Reading	16	24	40	67
Math	11	13	53	61
Science	16	10	23	37
Social Studies	17	22	48	51
Writing	11	23	46	54

Teachers and parents credit the school's remarkable improvement to its commitment to ensuring that all children achieve at high levels and its relentless focus on student achievement. Jacqueline Austin, the school's principal, notes that National Alliance workshops and technical assistance have helped her improve her own ability to analyze student performance data and to focus the school's strategies on improving performance.

Kennedy Elementary is continuing its quest to reach its goal of ensuring that all students reach high standards of performance. This year, Austin and her staff are focusing on improving performance in reading and literacy by aligning its reading curriculum more closely to standards and concentrating its professional development resources on enabling teachers to use instructional strategies tied to standards for student performance.

Canyon Creek Elementary School, Bothell, WA

Canyon Creek Elementary School has attained what one parent calls "a track record of success" by maintaining an unswerving commitment to improving performance for all students, particularly the lowest performers, and doing whatever it takes to achieve the goals. And parents and members of the community feel that the school has succeeded, and that students are learning consistently.

Canyon Creek has also developed a discipline policy that has had a dramatic effect at the school and was chosen as exemplary by the district. Drawn up by a committee composed of parents and staff members, it states rights, rules, and consequences.

This year's goal for performance-driven improvement was to increase by eight percent the number of students who read above the 80 percent mark and to decrease by 16 percent the number of children who were reading below the 25 percent level. In order to

measure progress, the school had to identify a new assessment instrument since the current assessment tested reading performance only in the fourth grade.

The Canyon Creek approach for this coming year is to institute a new calendar aimed at helping them reach their performance targets more efficiently and effectively. Under the calendar, students will be in school 4.5 days a week, and school will close early on Friday to permit time for teachers to plan together and develop professionally. This calendar shift was developed during a three-day retreat of parents and staff, and adopted by an 85 percent vote. It represents a typical effort by Canyon Creek to listen to the entire community, take risks, and involve everyone in decisions.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to tell the ranking member that I respect his views and would submit that perhaps this money, this \$200 million in the bill for whole school reform, would still be better spent meeting the Federal obligation to provide special education services to children with learning disabilities.

I would also point out that perhaps, if we really did respect the idea of local control and decentralized decision-making in public education, perhaps if we have to spend the money, we are better off block-granting it back down to local communities.

But I do want to point out that through the bipartisan compromise we have worked out, we will be adding language down through the bill, through my en bloc amendment that says, and I think it is important for Members to hear this language, that such approaches, and we have changed whole school reform to mean comprehensive school reforms, we have changed the definitional language, and then we say provided that such approaches show the most promise of enabling children served by title I, the educationally disadvantaged children, to meet challenging State content standards and challenging State student performance standards, which shall include an emphasis on basic academics and parental involvement based on proven research and practices.

So I think it is important that we understand that we are stressing again State and local roles in determining how this money will be spent, and we feel that that is the best way to ensure proper accountability for the use of this \$200 million in funding.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mrs. NORTHUP].

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues for helping to pull us all together today to resolve our differences. I want to thank particularly the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. I think that their help in putting a resolution to those things that divided us was very important.

I appreciate their leadership and I appreciate that they proved one more time that it is important to put all the good ideas on the table; and that when

we are talking about education, it is not about winning or losing, but trying to pull together some concept of what works and making sure that that is what we do.

I want to thank all members of the committee for their dedication to public schools. Regardless of whether we feel strongly about what other schools exist in this country, I believe that public schools will always be a critical part and a very important part of what the education picture is for all of the children in this country.

The gentleman from Wisconsin and I share the same objectives. All the things the gentleman said about education and about resolving the school crises that we have, I share the gentleman's vision of what makes those schools better. I could not agree more with the gentleman about his description of how schools succeed, and for that reason, I look forward to working together with this committee in the future to build strong and better public schools.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG].

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

As an individual who has spoken out on this floor on this issue several times already in the course of this debate, I want to tell my colleagues that I believe the compromise that has been struck is indeed a very good one; and I compliment the ranking member and the chairman of the subcommittee and all who have been involved in it.

At least insofar as I understand the agreement which has been reached, I think it does a great deal of good. Let me just, if I might, make it clear what that understanding is by emphasizing what is important to me and then entering into a brief colloquy with the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] and, hopefully, a brief colloquy with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Let me begin by saying, when the issue of Whole School Reform was raised by the language in this bill, that became a topic of concern for many of us and many of us spoke out on that topic. I want to make it clear that Whole School Reform, as it is set forth in the studies that the gentleman from Wisconsin has described, is not something I object to. My concern is that, as the bill was written and with its reference to the prior authorization which said the moneys had to be spent on Whole School Reform, what we were doing was federally mandating school reform only so long as it fit into the box of Whole School Reform, however that term is defined by those studies.

As I have listened to the gentleman from Wisconsin in this discussion and to the gentleman from California, I think the amendment that we have now agreed upon, striking the words "Whole School Reform" and instead inserting the definitional language which

says that these moneys will be available for school reform standards or school reform programs which meet State content standards and State student performance standards with emphasis on basic academics and parental involvement, go a tremendous way toward resolving my concern that we were in fact doing top down.

I would have to agree with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mrs. NORTHUP]. I could not agree more with the description which the gentleman from Wisconsin just gave of the critical importance of allowing these decisions to be made right at the school level by parents, by teachers, by school administrators in their own schools. My concern with the language of the bill as it existed before this agreement was that we were saying they could do it, but only if they did it to fit into the box of Whole School Reform.

I listened to the gentleman from Wisconsin describe what he sees here, and he emphasizes local reform, and I am extremely pleased by that.

If I could ask the gentleman from California to join me in a discussion. Is it the gentleman's understanding of the language, which we are substituting into the bill as a result of this compromise, that it makes it clear that the school reforms which will qualify for these moneys includes school reforms created and designed at the local level and not necessarily having them meet any Federal definition of what is acceptable or not acceptable?

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHADEGG. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, that is my interpretation of my en bloc amendment. The fact that we have now added language saying that these funds must be spent, shall be spent to help children meet challenging State content standards and challenging State student performance standards will have the effect of bringing that Federal funding under State and local control.

It will certainly allow local discretion in terms of how those funds are spent pursuant to existing State education law, but provided that the funds are spent, again as I just mentioned, to promote student achievement, student accomplishment in the area of statewide educational standards.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, just to further clarify, the language does not impose any Federal standard or requirement that it must fit a particular Federal mold?

Mr. RIGGS. If the gentleman will continue to yield, that is my understanding, yes. And I understand the gentleman's concern is that we create these programs very often and they have the effect of enticing States to perhaps change their curriculum, change their educational program in order to gain access to Federal dollars.

What we have tried to do here is to make sure that the emphasis is again on State standards and State content

standards and State student performance standards.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, once again reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for that clarification.

It had been my intent to offer an amendment to transfer the entire \$200 million, which is the subject of this debate and of this appropriation, to the IDEA Program, because I do think that is an important program, and it is right now a partially unfunded mandate.

But, as crafted, I believe that this amendment on which we have struck a bipartisan compromise resolves my concerns, and I have no intention of offering that amendment, assuming that we have agreement.

I listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin, in which again I agree with the gentleman wholeheartedly, that he believes we should enable school districts to reform how they do everything they do. I certainly agree with the gentleman on the issue of comprehensive reform. I do not think that it is reform to just bring in computers or just do one piece.

If I could just clarify that. It is the gentleman's understanding that this leaves these decisions to parents and teachers and administrators at the local level on how best to reform their school and improve education for their children?

□ 1530

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman will yield, as the committee indicated in its report, as we have indicated in our press statements, as we have indicated in our Dear Colleague letters for the last 3 weeks, as I have indicated on seven previous occasions on the floor, and as I emphasize again now, this package simply provides Federal money so that local schools can examine all of the possibilities for improving the way they work in their own schools on a comprehensive basis so that they can do what I hope everybody believes in, which is to find a model which really does raise performance. There are a lot of people shopping models around this country who make a heck of a lot of money with ideas that do not produce any real change for kids. What we are trying to do is to help local schools to get some idea of what works and what does not. They are free to develop any idea they want, but it is our obligation after we have spent millions of dollars on research to help them understand what works and what does not so they can make their own decisions.

Mr. SHADEGG. I appreciate the clarification from the gentleman. I certainly agree with him. There ought to be an examination of the success or failure, and I am thrilled to hear that there will be no top-down Federal mandate on what these programs must include or not include.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TIERNEY].

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time and again congratulate him and the gentleman from Illinois for working out this bill and this particular provision within the bill.

Let me say that I think that many of us have long ago gotten the idea that now certain Members on the other side are finally catching on to, is that nobody is trying to do anything except find a way to educate our children. We are not trying to have the Federal Government try to do it. We are trying to provide the resources so that communities can do it. This is about opportunity, the opportunity that exists within our public schools so that we can take the responsibility. People in the community, whether it is the business community, the colleges surrounding public education institutions, the teachers, whether they belong to unions, the administration and parents, to seize the responsibility to come together and do something that we all want to do.

I do not care personally whether we call it a charter school or whether we call it a whole school, whether we call it comprehensive school reform, whatever the semantics may be. The idea is that we are actually trying to get to the point that we can take a blank educational canvas and work together to develop the foundation for a school system, a public school system that is the one that we want.

This is happening in Salem, MA at a school called the Saltonstall School, and people often mistake it for a whole school or a charter school because it has all of those elements. The point I want to make is that it is a public school. We did not make that school better by creating a separate institution and a separate structure somewhere else and dividing the money and resources taking it out of the public school system and setting it aside. We did it by investing and providing resources so that that community at the local level in Salem could use the resources of Salem State College, the business community around Salem, the teachers from the teachers union sitting down and negotiating how they were going to go extra hours during the day and a longer period. It is the first public school in New England to be a year-round institution. It is working. They got together, they decided on a mission and they put it in writing. Whether you want to call it a charter or just call it an assessment or a standard, whatever it is, they put it in writing. Now they shoot for it. They decided what the mission of that school is going to be, and it happens to be math and science. They got parents involved, 140 volunteers every week in that school helping to work together. They decided how they were going to move forward as a group and as a community and they have done that. They have set those standards and they measure them year by year to see how

they are doing against that. It is working. Achievement levels are increasing rapidly.

People in the middle school look forward to seeing these children come out of the Saltonstall School in fifth grade and come into the sixth grade because they know they are going to be ready. When you visit the school, the children are excited about learning. Their parents are excited about participating in the process, and the community knows that it has a good model there. When you go to somebody like Kathleen Corley, the principal of that school, who has had a tremendous amount of impact on the community by working with all those folks, and you ask what is the one reason why the city of Salem and other communities do not have public schools of the nature and quality of the Saltonstall School, her answer would be resources.

That is what we are able to do with this Federal program, provide the resources so that the local community can seize the public school opportunity, take the responsibility to work as a community and make the concept work, to raise the bar and raise the standard and provide the means for these students to have the opportunity. This program, \$200 million, will give us the chance to broaden out what has already been shown to be successful in about 1,200 schools throughout this country and show everybody that this is the way to provide good, equal educational opportunity for the students in this country. It is through the public school system, it is not by walking away from them. It is by recognizing what works, celebrating what works, giving it the resources to be duplicated and making sure that we have the best educational infrastructure as an investment in our future.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH].

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] in a brief colloquy about the intent of this amendment. As the gentleman knows, originally the amendment was drafted, and I was a cosponsor of it, that took the \$200 million from this whole school reform program and put the bulk of it into the block grant under chapter 2 but \$15 million into a program to provide computers and \$5 million into the Jacob Javits Program for gifted and talented students. I wanted to clarify that the new amendment, the new language that redefines the authorizing section for this program, that it is written, in my understanding, broad enough to include particularly the Jacob Javits Program for gifted and talented students or at least students who would be participating in that program who would also be eligible for title I, so that schools could use this money if they needed to increase their compliance to State standards and directed toward title I students for gifted and talented programs in which those students could participate.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McINTOSH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, the first thing I would like to do is thank him for his help and support and his leadership on this amendment. He is absolutely correct. Under the original substitute, not the en bloc substitute that is pending here on the floor but under our original substitute, the gentleman is right, we would have redesignated \$5 million of the \$200 million for the Jacob Javits gifted and talented student program.

As to the gentleman's question, yes, it is my understanding that this money could be used for gifted and talented students, for a GATE Program, I believe is the acronym that you would normally use, at the local level, provided it is part of comprehensive school reform. But yes, if a child is gifted and talented and they also qualify under title I as educationally and socially disadvantaged, then they absolutely could be assisted under this program and the \$200 million that has now been set aside in the bill to promote comprehensive school reform.

Mr. McINTOSH. Let me say that I would urge the department to implement this new approach in exactly that way, to give the schools as much leeway and to include, wherever possible, gifted and talented education programs, because it is my belief that the Department of Education programs should be helping schools meet special needs of their students, and in the same way that disabled students require additional funds, gifted and talented students often require programs that require additional funds. If not, we stand the risk of losing those students who become bored or disinterested in the educational program that is offered and they can, instead of turning out to be our brightest and best, they sometimes turn out to be among the worst members of society because they were never challenged with that type of program when they were young.

Mr. Chairman, referring to a report from the Yale Child Study Center, a School Development Program which was one of the three whole school reform programs that was originally mentioned in the legislation, there are some deep philosophical implications of moving to that type of approach. And so I am pleased that this Congress is holding back and not endorsing a whole school reform.

For example, this one says: We believe that "it takes a whole village to raise a child." That has become a very controversial notion and stands in many people's minds for a very liberal way of administering school programs.

Then turning further into the document, it says that all the adult stakeholders agree to use a "no-fault approach to solving problems." Many of us are worried that a "no-fault approach to solving problems" implies

that there is not a right and wrong answer on a math test or a spelling test and that that is one of the deep problems that we are seeing in our educational program.

I would commend the author of that en bloc amendment and thank my colleagues on the opposite side of the aisle who reluctantly agreed to it and support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the Yale Child Study Center School Development Program.

YALE CHILD STUDY CENTER SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

MISSION AND VISION OF THE SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The School Development Program is committed to the total development of all children by creating learning environments that support children's physical, cognitive, psychological, language, social and ethical development.

Our vision is to help create a just and fair society in which all children have the educational and personal opportunities that will allow them to become successful and satisfied participants in family and civic life.

CORE BELIEFS OF THE SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

We believe that "it takes a whole village to raise a child," noting especially that: children's most meaningful learning occurs through positive and supportive relationships with caring and nurturing adults; parents are children's first teachers; all parents, and staff members, and community member, regardless of position, has an important contribution to make towards improving students' education; and in order to bring out the best in children, adults must interact more collaboratively and sensitively with each other on behalf of children.

We believe children: should be at the center of the educational enterprise; are capable of higher learning; learn through various pathways: physical, cognitive, psychological, language, social, and ethical; and who develop well learn well.

We believe that teachers: work in supportive environments which maximize their ability to teach and prepare students for life beyond school; and develop positive relationships with parents to make the necessary bonds for effective teaching and learning.

We believe school communities: must be structured to promote collaborative decision making in order to create a culture of inclusion; should promote learning as a lifelong process; should embrace cultural, linguistic and ethnic differences to enhance the educational process for all people; use data from all levels of the system—student, school, and district to inform educational policies and practices; should view change as an ongoing process guide by continuous constructive feedback; design curriculum, instruction and assessment to align with and promote child and community development and high content area standards; provide administrators with the support they need to lead and manage schools; and promote organizational synergy among school boards, educators, and parents.

A BRIEF HISTORY AND SUMMARY OF THE SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The School Development Program (SDP) was established in 1968 in two elementary schools as a collaborative effort between the Yale University Child Study Center and the New Haven Public Schools. The two schools involved were the lowest achieving in the city, had poor attendance, and had serious relationship problems among students, staff,

and parents. Staff morale was low. Parents were angry and distrustful of the schools. Hopelessness and despair were pervasive.

The Child Study Center staff—social worker, psychologist, special education teacher, and child psychiatrist—provided the traditional support services from these disciplines but focused more on understanding the underlying problems and how to correct them. Problems were identified on both sides—family stress and student underdevelopment in areas necessary for school success, as well as organizational, management and child development knowledge and skill needs on the part of the school staff.

Because of pre-school experiences in families under stress, a disproportionate number of low-income children presented themselves to the schools in ways that were understood as "bad," under-motivated, and demonstrating low academic potential. The behavior, in fact, reflected underdevelopment, or else development that was appropriate on the playground, at home or other places outside of school, but inappropriate at school.

The school staffs lacked training in child development and behavior, and understood school achievement solely as a function of genetically determined intellectual ability and individual motivation. Because of this, the schools were ill-prepared to modify behavior or close the developmental gaps of their students. The staffs usually responded with punishment and low expectations. Such responses were understandable given the circumstances, but they usually led to more difficult staff-student interactions and, in turn, to difficult staff-parent and community interactions, staff frustration, and a lower level of performance by students, staff and parents.

Even when there was a desire to work differently, there was no mechanism at the building level to allow parents, teachers, and administrators first to understand the needs, then to collaborate with and help each other address them in an integrated, coordinated way. This led to blame-finding, fragmentation, duplication of efforts, and frustration. There was no sense of ownership and pride in the school. The kind of synergism that develops when people work together to address problems and opportunities could not exist.

The model took shape in response to the conditions in the schools. Dr. Comer and his colleagues, working collaboratively with parents and staff, gradually developed the current nine-component process model (3 mechanisms, 3 operations, and 3 guiding principles). In the first category is (1) a School Planning and Management Team representative of the parents, teachers, administrators and support staff; (2) a Student and Staff Support Team (formerly called the Mental Health Team); and (3) Parent Team.

The School Planning and Management Team carries out three critical operations: the development of a (4) Comprehensive School Plan with specific goals in improving school climate and academic areas; (5) staff development activities based on building-level goals in these areas; and (6) periodic assessment which allows the staff to modify the program to meet identified needs and opportunities.

Successful implementation of the School Development Program requires several important guiding principles and agreements. All the adult stakeholders agree to use (7) a "no fault" approach to solving problems. This allows school teams to use all their time and energy on problem solving. Many groups get bogged down and are unable to move forward because blame creates defensive behavior and conflict. When people use "no fault," they can speak up without fear of attack or blame.

The School Development Program uses (8) consensus decision making rather than voting as the way to make decisions. Discussions keep the developmental needs of children in mind. One of the principal benefits of consensus decision making is that it minimizes "winner-loser" behavior and a variety of negative feelings that are common when decisions are made by voting.

Participants on the School Planning and Management Team (9) collaborate with the principal who is often the team's leader. Team members cannot paralyze the principal and on the other hand the principal cannot use the group as a "rubber stamp." In some cases, a staff member rather than the principal serves as a leader of the governance and management team. When this happens, it is often after all involved have become comfortable with the process, but sometimes it occurs at the outset. This works when it is a genuine arrangement to promote leadership from within the staff, and not as an act of disengagement. With this arrangement, it is important for the principal to be present and fully involved both in meetings and in facilitating the process. These nine components, developed in the 1968-69 school year, continue to make up the essential elements of the School Development Program.

A BRIEF SUMMARY OF SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM EFFECTS

Past efforts to document the effects of the School Development Program have been consistent with our philosophy that educational improvement embodies academic as well as personal and social growth. To document the effects, a combination of three research strategies are used: (1) quantitative (e.g., Surveys), (2) qualitative (e.g., our ethnographic protocols), and (3) theory development. These strategies have been employed to document academic effects, behavior and school adjustment effects, self-concept, and our school climate.

Studies conducted by the School Development Program and other researchers provide evidence of significant SDP effects on school climate, student attendance, and student achievement. SDP effects are usually first manifested in the improvement of the school climate, indicated by improved relationships among the adults in the school, better collaboration among staff members, and greater focus on the child as the center of the education process. Research showed that schools in which the SDP guiding principles ("no fault" problem solving, consensus decision making and collaboration) were followed consistently, there was a significantly greater decline in absenteeism and suspension rates compared to the district as a whole. Comparative studies of SDP and non-SDP schools reported significantly higher self competence, self-concept, and achievement for SDP students than for non-SDP students.

Qualitative analyses of more than 130 interviews of parents, students, teachers, principals, and other school personnel from ten schools indicated (a) improved parental and community involvement, (b) strong, positive climate, (c) increased team work and greater coordination, (d) greater focus on child-centered issues for comprehensive school planning, and (e) greater top-down and bottom-up management. These analyses also showed that the Student and Staff Support Teams (formerly called Mental Health Teams) focused primarily on prevention rather than crisis management. These teams established stronger linkages between schools and communities in order to better facilitate services to students. The three SDP structures (School Planning and Management Team, Student and Staff Support Team and the Parent Team) and the three guiding principles served as vehicles for

bringing the school and community together to resolve conflicts and reach solutions.

WELCOME TO THE HOME OF SUCCESS FOR ALL™ AND ROOTS & WINGS™

(By Johns Hopkins University)

Success For All™ (SFA) and Roots & Wings™ are comprehensive school restructuring programs for students in grades Pre-K to Six.

The idea behind the SFA™ program is to organize resources to focus on prevention and early intervention, to ensure that virtually every student will succeed in reading throughout the elementary grades—and no student will be allowed to "fall between the cracks." This highly successful model is currently in use in 750 schools in 37 states.

The goal of Roots & Wings™ is to ensure every child a firm foundation in the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in today's world, and to go far beyond this to higher-order learning and integration of knowledge.

Roots refers to strategies designed to ensure that every child meets world class standards—effective instructional programs in reading, writing, and language arts; tutoring for children struggling with reading; integrated health, mental health, and social services; and family support. These elements are based on Success for All™.

Wings refers to improvements in curriculum and instruction designed to let children soar. A key component of Wings is a science and social studies program called WorldLab™, which includes a set of simulations in which students will be able to apply knowledge and skills in flexible, creative, and integrated ways to solve problems. Children in WorldLab™ design and test efficient vehicles, explore African culture and agriculture, write a new U.S. Constitution, or investigate sources of pollution in local waterways.

MathWings™, based on NCTM standards, provides practical constructivist approaches to math emphasizing cooperative learning, complex problem solving, games, and discovery.

SUCCESS FOR ALL™

Tutors

In grades 1-3, specially trained, certified teachers work one-on-one with any students who are failing to keep up with their classmates in reading. First grade students have priority for tutoring.

Eight-week assessments

Students in grades 1-5 are assessed every eight weeks to determine whether they are making adequate progress in reading. This information is used to assign students to tutoring, to suggest alternative teaching strategies in the regular classroom, and to make changes in reading group placement, family support interventions, or other means of meeting students' needs. The school facilitator coordinates this process with the active involvement of teachers in grade-level teams.

Early learning (preschool and kindergarten)

Whenever possible, a half-day preschool program is provided for all four-year-olds. The program emphasizes language development, readiness, and positive self-concept. A full-day kindergarten program continues the emphasis on language, using children's literature and big books, as well as oral and written composition, activities promoting the development of concepts about print, alphabet games, and math concept development. Peabody Language Development Kits are used to provide additional experience in language.

Reading and writing programs

During reading periods, students are regrouped across age lines for 90 minutes so

that each reading class contains students reading at one level. This eliminates the need to have reading groups within the class and increases the amount of time for direct instruction. Also, use of tutors as reading teachers during reading time reduces the size of most reading classes. The reaching program in grades K-1 emphasizes the development of language skills and launches students into reading using phonetically regular storybooks supported by careful instruction that focuses on phonemic awareness, auditory discrimination, and sound blending as well as meaning, context, and self-monitoring strategies. Students become fluent as they read and reread to one another in pairs.

At the second through fifth grade levels, students use school or district selected reading materials, basals, and/or trade books in a carefully structured set of interactive opportunities to read, discuss, and write. This program emphasizes cooperative learning activities built around partner reading, identification of characters, settings, and problem solutions in narratives, story summarization, writing, and direct instruction in reading comprehension skills. At all levels, students read books of their choice for twenty minutes each evening as homework. Classroom libraries of books are developed for this purpose. For schools with Spanish bilingual programs, Success For All™ provides a Spanish reading curriculum, *Exito Para Todos*, in grades 1-5.

Writing is emphasized throughout the grades. Writing instruction uses a writer's workshop format in which students plan, draft, revise, edit, and publish compositions with feedback at each stage from teachers and peers.

Cooperative learning

Cooperative learning is the vehicle that drives the Success For All™ curriculum. Students work together in partnerships and teams, helping one another to become strategic readers and writers. Emphasis is placed on individual accountability, common goals, and recognition of group success.

Family support team

The family support team works with parents in ensuring the success of their children. The team focuses on promoting parent involvement, developing plans to meet the needs of individual students having difficulty, implementing attendance plans, and integrating community and school resources. The team is composed of the principal or assistant principal, facilitator, social worker, and other personnel.

Facilitator

A full-time facilitator works with teachers in each Success For All™ school to help them implement the reading program. In addition, the facilitator coordinates eight-week assessments, assists the Family Support Team, facilitates staff support teams, plans and implements staff development, and helps all teachers make certain that every child is making adequate progress.

Staff support teams

Teachers in the Success For All™ program support one another through the training and implementation process in coaching partnerships, grade level teams, and other staff team configurations. These teams become a catalyst for the dissemination of new material, goal setting, and problem solving, and they provide a supportive forum for discussion around new instructional strategies.

Professional development

Professional development for Success For All™ requires three days for all teachers before the program begins. Success For All™ consultants return to the school for three two-day visits during the school year to

work with principal, facilitators, and teachers to build a strong implementation. Success For All™ facilitators are available for telephone consultation during the year. Building facilitators follow up on initial training with classroom visits, coaching, and team meetings.

FOR ALL/ROOTS & WINGS™ FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Where is the program used?
What are the results?
What are the costs?
How do schools adopt Success for All™?
Where can I get more information?

Where is the program used?

As of the 1996-97 school year, Success For All™ is being implemented in more than 473 schools in over 126 districts in more than 37 states in all parts of the United States.

What are the results?

Success For All™ has been evaluated in several school districts. In each, matched Success For All™ and control schools have been compared on individually administered reading scales and other measures. The results have consistently favored Success For All™. In average grade equivalents, Success For All™ students perform approximately three months ahead of comparison students by the first grade, and more than a year ahead by fifth grade. Effects are particularly strong for students who are most at risk, those in the lowest 25% of their grades. Effects of the Spanish version of Success For All™, Lee Connigo, have also been strong. Positive effects have also been found on district-administered standardized tests. Success For All™ has produced substantial reductions in retentions and special education referrals and placements.

What are the costs?

Cost is based on the size and location of the individual school, and number of schools collaborating in training. Sample costs for a school of about 500 students in Pre-kindergarten through fifth grade range from \$45,000 to \$58,000 for Year 1; \$45,000 to \$52,000 for Year 2; and \$45,000 to \$52,000 for Year 3. (Add approximately \$55 for each student over 500.) These estimates include training, materials, follow-up visits, and other services. Actual costs will vary for different situations, depending in part on distances from training centers and local capacity to provide some training and follow-up and will be calculated for the individual school. (For more information see Considerations for Adoption)

How do schools adopt Success For All™?

We encourage district and school staff to review program materials, view video tapes, and visit nearby Success For All™ sites. Schools must apply to become a Success For All™ or Roots & Wings school. The application process insures that the school staff are aware of the elements of the program, have the resources to implement the program successfully, and agree as a staff to make the commitment to implement the program. A positive vote of 80% or more of all teachers is required.

Where can I get more information?

For awareness materials or information on training, school visits, or other assistance, contact us at: Success For All™ Program, Johns Hopkins University, 3505 N. Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21218, Phone: 410-516-8896 (in Maryland), or 1-800-548-4998, fax us at: 410-516-8890, or you can browse our Web site.

SUCCESS FOR ALL/ROOTS AND WINGS SUMMARY OF RESEARCH ON ACHIEVEMENT OUTCOMES

(By Robert E. Slavin, Nancy A. Madden, and Barbara A. Wasik)

Ms. Martin's kindergarten class has some of the brightest, happiest, friendliest, and most op-

timistic kids you'll ever meet. Students in her class are glad to be in school, proud of their accomplishments, certain that they will succeed at whatever the school has to offer. Every one of them is a natural scientist, a storyteller, a creative thinker, a curious seeker of knowledge. Ms. Martin's class could be anywhere—in suburb or ghetto, small town or barrio—it doesn't matter. Kindergartners everywhere are just as bright, enthusiastic and confident as her kids are.

Only a few years from now, many of these same children will have lost the spark they all started with. Some will have failed a grade. Some will be in special education. Some will be in long-term remediation, such as Title I or other remedial programs. Some will be bored or anxious or unmotivated. Many will see school as a chore rather than a pleasure and will no longer expect to excel. In a very brief span of time, Ms. Martin's children will have defined themselves as successes or failures in school. All too often, only a few will still have a sense of excitement and positive self-expectations about learning. We cannot predict very well which of Ms. Martin's students will succeed and which will fail, but we can predict—based on the past—that if nothing changes, far too many will fail. This is especially true if Ms. Martin's kindergarten happens to be located in a high-poverty neighborhood, in which there are typically fewer resources in the school to provide top-quality instruction to every child, fewer forms of rescue if children run into academic difficulties, and fewer supports for learning at home. Preventable failures occur in all schools, but in high poverty schools failure can be endemic, so widespread that it makes it difficult to treat each child at risk of failure as a person of value in need of emergency assistance to get back on track. Instead, many such schools do their best to provide the greatest benefit to the greatest number of children possible, but have an unfortunately well-founded expectation that a certain percentage of students will fall by the wayside during the elementary years.

Any discussion of school reform should begin with Ms. Martin's kindergartners. The first goal of reform should be to ensure that every child—regardless of home background, home language, or learning style—achieves the success that he or she so confidently expected in kindergarten, that all children maintain their motivation, enthusiasm, and optimism because they are objectively succeeding at the school's tasks. Any reform that does less than this is hollow and self-defeating. What does it mean to succeed in the early grades? The elementary schools' definition of success, and therefore the parents' and children's definition as well, is overwhelmingly success in reading. Very few children who are reading adequately are retained, assigned to special education, or given long-term remedial services. Other subjects are important, of course, but reading and language arts form the core of what school success means in the early grades.

When a child fails to read well in the early grades, he or she begins a downward progression. In first grade, some children begin to notice that they are not reading adequately. They may fail first grade or be assigned to long term remediation. As they proceed through the elementary grades, many students begin to see that they are failing at their full-time jobs. When this happens, things begin to unravel. Failing students begin to have poor motivation and poor self-expectations, which lead to continued poor achievement, in a declining spiral that ultimately leads to despair, delinquency, and dropout.

Remediating learning deficits after they are already well established is extremely dif-

ficult. Children who have already failed to learn to read, for example, are now anxious about reading, and doubt their ability to learn it. Their motivation to read may be low. They may ultimately learn to read but it will always be a chore, not a pleasure. Clearly, the time to provide additional help to children who are at risk is early, when children are still motivated and confident and when any learning deficits are relatively small and remediable. The most important goal in educational programming for students at risk of school failure is to try to make certain that we do not squander the greatest resource we have—the enthusiasm and positive self-expectations of young children themselves.

In practical terms, what this perspective implies is that schools, and especially Title I, special education, and other services for at-risk children, must be shifted from an emphasis on remediation to an emphasis on prevention and early intervention. Prevention means providing developmentally appropriate preschool and kindergarten programs so that students will enter first grade ready to succeed, and it means providing regular classroom teachers with effective instructional programs, curricula, and professional development to enable them to see that most students are successful the first time they are taught. Early intervention means that supplementary instructional services are provided early in students' schooling and that they are intensive enough to bring at-risk students quickly to a level at which they can profit from good quality classroom instruction.

The purpose of this report is to describe the current state of research on the achievement outcomes of Success for All, a program built around the idea that every child can and must succeed in the early grades, no matter what this takes. The idea behind Success for All is to use everything we know about effective instruction for students at risk to direct all aspects of school and classroom organization toward the goal of preventing academic deficits from appearing in the first place; recognizing and intensively intervening with any deficits that do appear; and providing students with a rich and full curriculum to enable them to build on their firm foundation in basic skills. The commitment of Success for All is to do whatever it takes to see that all children become skilled, strategic, and enthusiastic readers as they progress through the elementary grades. In addition, this report describes research on Roots and Wings, a program that adds to Success for All programs in mathematics, science, and social studies (Slavin, Madden, & Wasik, 1996).

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Success for All

Success for All exists as a separate program and also serves as the reading/writing/language arts component for Roots and Wings. Success for All is built around the assumption that every child can read. We mean this not as wishful thinking or as a philosophical statement, but as a practical, attainable reality. In particular, every child without organic retardation can learn to read. Some children need more help than others and may need different approaches than those needed by others, but one way or another every child can become a successful reader.

Success for All began in one Baltimore elementary school in 1987-1988, and since then has expanded each year of additional schools. As of Fall, 1996, it is in about 450 schools in 120 districts in 31 states throughout the United States. The districts range from some of the largest in the country, such as Baltimore, Houston, Memphis, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Chicago, New York, and

Miami, to such middle-sized districts as Richmond, Virginia; Rockford, Illinois; and Modesto and Riverside, California, to tiny rural districts, including two on the Navajo reservation in Arizona. Success for All reading curricula in Spanish have been developed and researched and are used in bilingual programs in California, Texas, Arizona, Florida, Illinois, New York, New Jersey, and Philadelphia. Almost all Success for All schools are high-poverty title I schools, and the great majority are schoolwide projects. Otherwise, the schools vary widely.

Success for All and Roots and Wings have somewhat different components at different sites, depending on the school's needs and resources available to implement the program (Slavin et al., 1996b). However, there is a common set of elements characteristic of all Success for All and Roots and Wings schools. These are described on the following pages.

Reading Program

Success for All and Roots and Wings use a reading curriculum based on research, on effective practices in beginning reading (e.g., Adams, 1990), and on effective use of cooperative learning (Slavin, 1995; Stevens, Madden, Slavin, & Farnish, 1987).

Reading teachers at every grade level begin the reading time by reading children's literature to students and engaging them in a discussion of the story to enhance their understanding of the story, listening and speaking vocabulary, and knowledge of story structure. In kindergarten and first grade, the program emphasizes the development of oral language and pre-reading skills through the use of thematically-based units which incorporate areas such as language arts and writing under a science or social studies topic. A component called Story Telling and Retelling (STaR) involves the students in listening to, retelling, and dramatizing children's literature. Big books as well as oral and written composing activities allow students to develop concepts of print as they develop knowledge of story structure. There is also a strong emphasis on phonemic awareness activities which help develop auditory discrimination and support the development of reading readiness strategies.

Reading Roots is typically introduced in the second semester of kindergarten or in first grade. This K-1 beginning reading program uses as its base a series of phonetically regular but meaningful and interesting minibooks and emphasizes repeated oral reading to partners as well as to the teacher. The minibooks begin with a set of "shared stories," in which part of a story is written in small type (read by the teacher) and part is written in large type (read by the students). The student portion uses a phonetically controlled vocabulary. Taken together, the teacher and student portions create interesting, worthwhile stories. Over time, the teacher portion diminishes and the student portion lengthens, until students are reading the entire book. This scaffolding allows students to read interesting literature when they only have a few letter sounds. Letters and letter sounds are introduced in an active, engaging set of activities that begins with oral language and moves into written symbols. Individual sounds are integrated into a context of words, sentences, and stories. Instruction is provided in story structure, specific comprehension skills, metacognitive strategies for self-assessment and self-correction, and integration of reading and writing.

Spanish bilingual programs use an adaptation of Reading Roots called Lee Connigo ("Read With Me"). Lee Connigo employs the same instructional strategies as Reading Roots, but uses Spanish reading materials.

When students reach the primer reading level, they use a program called Reading

Wings, an adaptation of Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) (Stevens, Madden, Slavin, & Farnish, 1987). Reading Wings uses cooperative learning activities built around story structure, prediction, summarization, vocabulary building, decoding practice, and story-related writing. Students engage in partner reading and structured discussion of stories or novels, and work toward mastery of the vocabulary and content of the story in teams. Story-related writing is also shared within teams. Cooperative learning both increases students' motivation and engages students in cognitive activities known to contribute to reading comprehension, such as elaboration, summarization, and rephrasing (see Slavin, 1995). Research on CIRC has found it to significantly increase students' reading comprehension and language skills (Stevens et al., 1987).

In addition to these story-related activities, teachers provide direct instruction in reading comprehension skills, and students practice these skills in their teams. Classroom libraries of trade books at students' reading levels are provided for each teacher, and students read books of their choice for homework for 20 minutes each night. Home readings are shared via presentations, summaries, puppet shows, and other formats twice a week during "book club" sessions.

Materials to support Reading Wings through the sixth grade (or beyond) exist in English and Spanish. The English materials are built around children's literature and around the most widely used basal series and anthologies. Supportive materials have been developed for more than 100 children's novels and for most current basal series. Spanish materials are similarly built around Spanish-language novels and basals.

Beginning in the second semester of program implementation, Success for All and Roots and Wings schools usually implement a writing/language arts program based primarily on cooperative learning principles (see Slavin, Madden, & Stevens, 1989/90).

Students in grades one to three (and sometimes 4 to 5 or 6) are regrouped for reading. The students are assigned to heterogeneous, age-grouped classes most of the day, but during a regular 90-minute reading period they are regrouped by reading performance levels into reading classes of students all at the same level. For example, a 2-1 reading class might contain first-, second-, and third-grade students all reading at the same level. The reading classes are smaller than home rooms because tutors and other certified staff (such as librarians or art teachers) teach reading during this common reading period. Regrouping allows teachers to teach the whole reading class without having to break the class into reading groups. This greatly reduces the time spent in seatwork and increases direct instruction time, eliminating workbooks, dittos, or other follow-up activities which are needed in classes that have multiple reading groups. The regrouping is a form of the Joplin Plan, which has been found to increase reading achievement in the elementary grades (Slavin, 1987).

Eight-Week Reading Assessments

At eight-week intervals, reading teachers assess student progress through the reading program. The results of the assessments are used to determine who is to receive tutoring, to change students' reading groups, to suggest other adaptations in students' programs, and to identify students who need other types of assistance, such as family interventions or screening for vision and hearing problems. The assessments are curriculum-based measures that include teacher observations and judgments as well as more formal measures of reading comprehension.

Reading Tutors

One of the most important elements of Success for All and Roots and Wings is the use of tutors to promote students' success in reading. One-to-one tutoring is the most effective form of instruction known (see Wasik & Slavin, 1993). The tutors are certified teachers with experience teaching Title I, special education, and/or primary reading. Often, well-qualified paraprofessionals also tutor children with less severe reading problems. In this case, a certified tutor monitors their work and assists with the diagnostic assessment and intervention strategies. Tutors work one-on-one with students who are having difficulties keeping up with their reading groups. The tutoring occurs in 20-minute sessions during times other than reading or math periods.

In general, tutors support students' success in the regular reading curriculum, rather than teaching different objectives. For example, the tutor will work with a student on the same story and concepts being read and taught in the regular reading class. However, tutors seek to identify learning problems and use different strategies to teach the same skills. They also teach metacognitive skills beyond those taught in the classroom program. Schools may have as many as six or more teachers serving as tutors depending on school size, need for tutoring, and other factors.

During daily 90-minute reading periods, certified tutors serve as additional reading teachers to reduce class size for reading. Reading teachers and tutors use brief forms to communicate about students' specific problems and needs and meet at regular times to coordinate their approaches with individual children.

Initial decisions about reading group placement and the need for tutoring are based on informal reading inventories that the tutors give to each child. Subsequent reading group placements and tutoring assignments are made using the curriculum-based assessments described above. First-graders receive priority for tutoring, on the assumption that the primary function of the tutors is to help all students be successful in reading the first time, before they fail and become remedial readers.

Preschool and Kindergarten

Most Success for All and Roots and Wings schools provide a half-day preschool and/or a full-day kindergarten for eligible students. The preschool and kindergarten programs focus on providing a balanced and developmentally appropriate learning experience for young children. The curriculum emphasizes the development and use of language. It provides a balance of academic readiness and non-academic music, art, and movement activities in a series of thematic, interdisciplinary units. Readiness activities include use of the Peabody Language Development Kits and Story Telling and Retelling (STaR) in which students retell stories read by the teachers. Pre-reading activities begin during the second semester of kindergarten.

Family Support Team

Parents are an essential part of the formula for success in Success for All and Roots and Wings. A Family Support Team works in each school, serving to make families feel respected and welcome in the school and become active supporters of their child's education as well as providing specific services. The Family Support Team consists of the Title I parent liaison, vice-principal (if any), counselor (if any), facilitator, and any other appropriate staff already present in the school or added to the school staff.

The Family Support Team first works toward good relations with parents and to increase involvement in the schools. Family

Support Team members may complete "welcome" visits for new families. They organize many attractive programs in the school, such as parenting skills workshops. Most schools use a program called "Raising Readers" in which parents are given strategies to use in reading with their own children.

The Family Support Team also intervenes to solve problems. For example, they may contact parents whose children are frequently absent to see what resources can be provided to assist the family in getting their child to school. Family support staff, teachers, and parents work together to solve school behavior problems. Also, family support staff are called on to provide assistance when students seem to be working at less than their full potential because of problems at home. Families of students who are not receiving adequate sleep or nutrition, need glasses, are not attending school regularly, or are exhibiting serious behavior problems, may receive family support assistance.

The Family Support Team is strongly integrated into the academic program of the school. It receives referrals from teachers and tutors regarding children who are not making adequate academic progress, and thereby constitutes an additional stage of intervention for students in need above and beyond that provided by the classroom teacher or tutor. The Family Support Team also encourages and trains the parents to fulfill numerous volunteer roles within the school, ranging from providing a listening ear to emerging readers to helping in the school cafeteria.

Program Facilitator

A program facilitator works at each school to oversee (with the principal) the operation of the Success for All and Roots and Wings models. The facilitator helps plan the program, helps the principal with scheduling, and visits classes and tutoring sessions frequently to help teachers and tutors with individual problems. He or she works directly with the teachers on implementation of the curriculum, classroom management, and other issues, helps teachers and tutors deal with any behavior problems or other special problems, and coordinates the activities of the Family Support Team with those of the instruction staff.

Teachers and Teacher Training

The teachers and tutors are regular certified teachers. They receive detailed teacher's manuals supplemented by three days of inservice at the beginning of the school year. In Roots and Wings schools, this level of inservice continues over a three-year period as the main program elements are phased in.

Throughout the year, follow-up visits are made to the school by project staff, who visit

classrooms, meet with school staff, and conduct inservice presentations on such topics as classroom management, instructional pace, and cooperative learning. Facilitators also organize many informal sessions to allow teachers to share problems and problem solutions, suggest changes, and discuss individual children. The staff development model used in Success for All and Roots and Wings emphasizes relatively brief initial training with extensive classroom follow-up, coaching, and group discussion.

Advisory Committee

An advisory committee composed of the building principal, program facilitator, teacher representatives, parent representatives, and family support staff meets regularly to review the progress of the program and to identify and solve any problems that arise. In most schools existing site-based management teams are adapted to fulfill this function. In addition, grade-level teams and the Family Support Team meet regularly to discuss common problems and solutions and to make decisions in their areas of responsibility.

Special Education

Every effort is made to deal with student's learning problems within the context of the regular classroom, as supplemented by tutors. Tutors evaluate student's strengths and weaknesses and develop strategies to teach in the most effective way. In some schools, special education teachers work as tutors and reading teachers with students identified as learning disabled as well as other students experiencing learning problems who are at risk for special education placement. One major goal of Success for All and Roots and Wings is to keep students with learning problems out of special education if at all possible, and to serve any students who qualify for special education in a way that does not disrupt their regular classroom experience (see Slavin, Madden, Karweit, Dolan, Wasik, Shaw, Mainzer, & Haxby, 1991).

Roots and Wings

Roots and Wings (Slavin, Madden, Dolan, & Wasik, 1994; Slavin, Madden, & Wasik, 1996) is a comprehensive reform design for elementary schools that adds to Success for All innovative programs in mathematics, social studies, and science.

Roots and Wings schools begin by implementing all components of Success for All, described above. In the second year of implementation they typically begin to incorporate the additional major components. MathWings is the name of the mathematics program used in grades 1-5. It is a constructivist approach to mathematics based on NCTM standards, but designed to be practical and effective in schools serving many

students placed at risk. MathWings makes extensive use of cooperative learning, games, discovery, creative problem solving, manipulatives, and calculators.

WorldLab is an integrated approach to social studies and science that engages students in simulations and group investigations. Students take on roles as various people in history, in different parts of the world, or in various occupations. For example, they work as engineers to design and test efficient vehicles, they form a state legislature to enact environmental legislation, they repeat Benjamin Franklin's experiments, and they solve problems of agriculture in Africa. In each activity students work in cooperative groups, do extensive writing, and use reading, mathematics, and fine arts skills learned in other parts of the program.

As of Fall 1996, approximately sixty schools in fifteen states are adding either MathWings or WorldLab to their implementations of Success for All, making themselves into Roots and Wings schools. Demonstration sites for the program are being established in many parts of the United States.

Research on Success for All and Roots and Wings

From the very beginning, there has been a strong focus in Success for All on research and evaluation. We began longitudinal evaluations of the program in its earliest sites, six schools in Baltimore and Philadelphia. Later, third-party evaluators at the University of Memphis—Steven Ross, Lana Smith, and their colleagues—added evaluations in Memphis, Houston, Tucson, Montgomery, Alabama, Ft. Wayne, Indiana, and Caldwell, Idaho. Most recently, studies focusing on English language learners in California have been conducted in Modesto and Riverside by the Southwest Regional Laboratory. Each of these evaluations has compared Success for All schools to matched comparison schools on measures of reading performance, starting with cohorts in kindergarten or in first grade and continuing to follow these students as long as possible (details of the evaluations design appear below). Vagaries of funding and other local problems have ended some evaluations prematurely, but most have been able to follow Success for All schools for many years. As of this writing, there are seven years of continuous data from the six original schools in Baltimore and Philadelphia, and varying numbers of years of data from seven other districts, a total of twenty-three schools (and their matched control schools). Information on these schools and districts is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESS FOR ALL SCHOOLS IN THE LONGITUDINAL STUDY

District/school	Enrollment	Percent free lunch	Ethnicity by percent	Date began SFA	Data collected	Pre-school?	Full-day K?	Comments
Baltimore:								
B1	500	83	B-96 W-4	1987	88-94	yes	yes	First SFA school; had additional funds first 2 years.
B2	500	96	B-100	1988	89-94	some	yes	Had additional funds first 4 years.
B3	400	96	B-100	1988	89-94	some	yes	
B4	500	85	B-100	1988	89-94	some	yes	
B5	650	96	B-100	1988	89-94	some	yes	
Philadelphia:								
P1	620	96	A-60 W-2 B-20	1988	89-94	no	yes	Large ESL program for Cambodian children.
P2	600	97	B-100	1991	92-93	some	yes	
P3	570	96	B-100	1991	92-93	no	yes	
P4	840	98	B-100	1991	93	no	yes	
P5	700	98	L-100	1992	93-94	no	yes	Study only involves students in Spanish bilingual program.
Charleston, SC:								
C51	500	40	B-60 W-40	1990	91-92	no	no	
Memphis, TN:								
M11	350	90	B-95 W-5	1990	91-94	yes	no	Program implemented only in grades K-2.
M12	530	90	B-100	1993	94	yes	yes	
M13	290	86	B-100	1993	94	yes	yes	
M14	370	90	B-100	1993	94	yes	yes	
Ft. Wayne, IN:								
F1	330	65	B-56 W-44	1991	92-94	no	yes	SFA schools (& controls) are part of desegregation plan.
F2	250	55	B-55 W-45	1991	92-94	no	yes	SFA schools (& controls) are part of desegregation plan.
Montgomery, AL:								
MA1	450	95	B-100	1991	93-94	no	yes	

TABLE 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESS FOR ALL SCHOOLS IN THE LONGITUDINAL STUDY—Continued

District/school	Enrollment	Percent free lunch	Ethnicity by percent	Date began SFA	Data collected	Pre-school?	Full-day K?	Comments
MA2 Caldwell, ID:	460	97	B-100	1991	93-94	no	yes	
C11 Modesto, CA:	400	20	W-80 L-20	1991	93-94	no	no	Study compares 2 SFA schools to Reading Recovery school.
MC1 MC2	640	70	W-54 L-25 A-17 B-4	1992	94	yes	no	Large ESL program for students speaking 17 languages.
MC2 Riverside, CA:	560	98	L-66 W-24 A-10	1992	94	yes	no	Large Spanish bilingual program.
R1 R1	930	73	L-54 W-33 B-10	1992	94	yes	no	Large Spanish bilingual & ESL programs; year-round school.

Key: B—African American; L—Latino; A—Asian American; W—White.

Evaluation Design

A common evaluation design, with variations due to local circumstances, has been used in all Success for All evaluations. Every Success for All school involved in a formal evaluation is matched with a control school that is similar in poverty level (percent of students qualifying for free lunch), historical achievement level, ethnicity, and other factors. Schools are also matched on district-administered standardized test scores given in kindergarten or (starting in 1991 in six districts) on Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) scores given by the project in the fall of kindergarten or first grade. The measures used in the evaluations were as follows:

Woodcock Reading Mastery Test.—Three Woodcock scales—Word Identification, Word Attack, and Passage Comprehension—were individually administered to students by trained testers. Word Identification assesses recognition of common sight words, Word Attack assesses phonetic synthesis skills, and Passage Comprehension assesses comprehension in context. Students in Spanish bilingual programs were given the Spanish versions of these scales.

Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty.—The Durrell Oral Reading scale was also individually administered to students in grades 1-3. It presents a series of graded reading passages which students read aloud, followed by comprehension questions.

Gray Oral Reading Test.—Comprehension and passage scores from the Gray Oral Reading Test were obtained from students in grades 4-5.

Analyses of covariance with pretests as covariates were used to compare raw scores in all evaluations, and separate analyses were conducted for students in general and for students in the lowest 25% of their grades.

The figures presented in this report summarize student performance in grade equivalents (adjusted for covariates) and effect size (proportion of a standard deviation separating the experimental and control groups), averaging across individual measures. Neither grade equivalents nor averaged scores were used in the analyses, but they are presented here as a useful summary.

Each of the evaluations summarized in this report follows children who began in Success for All in first grade or earlier, in comparison to children who had attended the control school over the same period. Students who start in it after first grade are not considered to have received the full treatment (although they are of course served within the schools).

Results for all experimental-control comparisons in all evaluation years are averaged and summarized in the following graph entitled "Comparison of Success for All and Control in Mean Reading Grade Equivalents and Effect Sizes 1988-1994" using a method called multi-site replicated experiment (Slavin et al., 1996a,b; Slavin & Madden, 1993).

For more details on methods and findings, see Slavin et al. (1996a,b) and the full site reports.

Reading Outcomes

The results of the multi-site replicated experiment evaluating Success for All are summarized in the following graph entitled "Comparison of Success for All and Control in Mean Reading Grade Equivalents and Effect Sizes 1988-1994" for each grade level, 1-5. The analyses compare cohort means for experimental and control schools; for example the Grade 1 graph compares 55 experimental to 55 control cohorts, with cohort (50-150 students) as the unit of analysis. In other words, each bar is a mean of scores from more than 5000 students. Grade equivalents are based on the means, and are only presented for their informational value. No analyses were done using grade equivalents.

Statistically significantly ($p=.05$ or better) positive effects of Success for All (compared to controls) were found on every measure at every grade level, 1-5. For students in general, effect sizes averaged around a half standard deviation at all grade levels. Effects were somewhat higher than this for the Woodcock Word Attack scale in grades 1 and 2, but in grades 3-5 effect sizes were more or less equivalent on all aspects of reading. Consistently, effect sizes for students in the lowest 25% of their grades were particularly positive, ranging from $ES=+1.03$ in first grades to $ES=+1.68$ in fourth grade. Again, cohort-level analyses found statistically significant differences favoring low achievers in Success for All on every measure at every grade level.

Roots and Wings

A study of Roots and Wings (Slavin, Madden, & Wasik, 1996) was carried out in four pilot schools in rural southern Maryland. The Roots and Wings schools serve populations that are significantly more disadvantaged than state averages. They average 48% free and reduced-price lunch eligibility, compared to 30% for the state; 21% of Roots and Wings students are Title I eligible, in comparison to 7% for the state. The assessment tracked growth over time on the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP), compared to growth in the state as a whole. The MSPAP is a performance measure on which students are asked to solve complex problems, set up experiments, write in various genres, and read extended text. It uses matrix sampling, which means that different students take different forms of the test.

In both third- and fifth-grade assessments in all subjects tested (reading, language, writing, math, science, and social studies), Roots and Wings students showed substantial growth, as shown in the following graphs.*

The State of Maryland gained in average performance on the MSPAP over the same time period, but the number of Roots and Wings students achieving at satisfactory or excellent increased by more than twice the state's rate on every measure at both grade levels.

*Graphs were not reproduced.

Effects on District-Administered Standardized Tests

The formal evaluations of Success for All have relied on individually administered assessments of reading. The Woodcock and Durrell scales used in these assessments are far more accurate than district-administered tests, and are much more sensitive to real reading gains. They allow testers to hear children actually reading material of increasing difficulty and responding to questions about what they have read. The Woodcock and Durrell are themselves nationally standardized tests, and produce norms (e.g., percentiles, NCEs and grade equivalents) just like any other standardized measure.

However, educators often want to know the effects of innovative programs on the kinds of group administered standardized tests they are usually held accountable for. To obtain this information, we have sometimes requested standardized test data for students in experimental and control schools, and some districts have done their own evaluations on their own measures. The following sections briefly summarize findings from these types of evaluations.

Baltimore, Maryland—Through the 1992-93 school year we collected CTBS scores for our five Success for All and control schools. On average, Success for All schools exceeded control schools at every grade level. The differences were statistically and educationally significant. By fifth grade, Success for All students were performing 75% of a grade equivalent ahead of controls ($ES=+0.45$) on CTBS Total Reading scores (see Slavin, Madden, Dolan, Wasik, Ross, & Smith, 1994).

Memphis, Tennessee—A longitudinal evaluation of three Memphis Success for All schools (now becoming Roots and Wings schools) by Ross, Smith, & Casey (1995) included an assessment of program effects on the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program's (TCAP) Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension tests. On average, the three Success for All schools exceeded the three controls by an effect size of $+0.38$ in first grade and $+0.45$ in second grade. Again, these effects are educationally and statistically significant.

Flint, Michigan—Two schools in Flint, Michigan began implementation of Success for All in 1992. The percentage of students passing the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) in reading at fourth grade has increased dramatically. Homedale Elementary had a pass rate of 2% in 1992, placing it last among the district's 32 elementary schools. In 1995, 48.6% of students passed, placing it first in the district. Merrill Elementary, 27th in the district in 1992 with only 9.5% of students passing, was 12th in 1995 with 22% passing. Over the same period the average for all Flint elementary schools only increased from 18.3% passing to 19.3%.

Ft. Wayne, Indiana—An evaluation in two schools in Ft. Wayne, Indiana (Ross, Smith, & Casey, 1995) found positive effects of Success for All on the reading comprehension scale of the ISTEP, Indiana's norm-referenced achievement test. In first grade, the

effect size was +0.49 for students in general and +1.13 for the lowest-performing 25%. In second grade, effect sizes were +0.64, and in third grade, $ES=+1.13$.

Miami, Florida—(Dade County) An evaluation of three Success for All schools (currently becoming Roots and Wings schools) was carried out by Yuwadee Wongbundhit (1995) of the Dade County Public Schools. In comparison to three control schools, the Success for All schools gained seven percentile points from grades 1-2 while matched control schools lost five points on the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT-8). In grades 2, 3, Success for All students gained only one percentile point, but controls lost eight.

Wichita Falls, Texas—Fannin Elementary School, the highest-poverty school in Wichita Falls, Texas, began implementation of Success for All in 1991. Its scores on the 1992 Texas Assessments of Academic Skills (TAAS) showed a dramatic improvement. The percentage of third-graders meeting minimum expectations in reading increased from 48% to 70% (during the same year, the district percentage declined by 3%). Fannin students also increased from 8% to 53% in the percentage of students meeting minimum expectations in writing.

Modesto, California—Two schools in Modesto, California have been implementing Success for all since 1991. Each year, their average NCE's in reading comprehension have increased significantly. In 1993, El Vista Elementary showed an NCE gain of 10.8; in grades two and three, the gains were 14.7 and 13.5, respectfully. Orville Wright Elementary showed gains averaging 4.6 in grades 2-3. On the Spanish Aprenda, Orville Wright students using the Lee Connigo program gained 9.5 NCEs. On the CLAS, California's experimental performance measure, both schools significantly exceeded their matched comparison group in 1993. Principals report that among students who have remained in the program since first grade, no third graders are reading below grade level.

Charleston, West Virginia—Chandler Elementary School began implementing Success for All in 1990. In the two years before the program was introduced, the school averaged an NCE score of 34. This increased to 43 in the first year after implementation and to 54 by the third year.

Changes in Effect Sizes over Years of Implementation

One interesting trend in outcomes from comparisons of Success for All and control schools relates to changes in effect sizes according to the number of years a school has been implementing the program. Figure 4, which summarizes these data, was created by pooling effect sizes for all cohorts in their first year of implementation, all in their second year, and so on, regardless of calendar year.

Figure 4 shows that mean reading effect sizes progressively increase with each year of implementation. For example, Success for All first-graders score substantially better than control first-graders at the end of the first year of implementation ($ES=+0.49$). The experimental-control difference is even higher for first graders attending schools in the second year of program implementation ($ES=+0.53$), increasing to an effect size of +0.73 for schools in their fourth implementation year. A similar pattern is apparent for second- and third-grade cohorts.

The data summarized in Figure 4 show that while Success for All has an immediate impact on student reading achievement, this impact grows over successive years of implementation. Over time, schools may become increasingly able to provide effective instruction to all of their students, to approach the goal of success for all.

Success for All and English Language Learners

The education of English language learners is at a crossroads. For many years, researchers, educators, and policy makers have debated questions of the appropriate language instruction for students who enter elementary school speaking languages other than English. Research on this topic has generally found that students taught to read their home language and then transitioned to English ultimately become better readers in English than do students taught to read only in English (Garcia, 1991; Willig, 1985; Wong-Fillmore & Valadez, 1986). More recently, however, attention has shifted to another question. Given that students are taught to read their home language, how can we ensure that they succeed in that language? (See, for example, Garcia, 1994.) There is no reason to expect that children failing to read well in Spanish, for example, will later become good readers and successful students in English. On the contrary, research consistently supports the common-sense expectation that the better students in Spanish bilingual programs read Spanish, the better their English reading will be (Garcia, 1991; Hakuta & Garcia, 1989). Clearly, the quality of instruction in home-language reading is a key factor in the ultimate school success of English language learners, and must be a focus of research on the education of these children.

Francis Scott Key (ESL)—An adaptation of Success for All to the needs of ESL students was evaluated at Philadelphia's Francis Scott Key Elementary School, a majority-Cambodian school in which virtually all children are in poverty. Francis Scott Key was evaluated in comparison to a similar Philadelphia elementary school.

Results: Asian Students—Success for All Asian students in grades 3-5, most of whom had been in the program since kindergarten, performed far better than control students. Differences between Success for All and control students were statistically significant on every measure at every grade level ($p<.001$). Median grade equivalents and effect sizes were computed across the three Woodcock scales. On average, Success for All Asian students exceeded control students in reading grade equivalents by almost three years in third grade (median $ES=+1.76$), more than 2 years in fourth grade (median $ES=+1.46$), and about three years in fifth grade (median $ES=+1.44$). Success for All Asian students were reading more than a full year above grade level in grade 3 and more than a half-year above in fourth and fifth grade, while similar control students were reading more than a year below grade level at all three grade levels.

Results: Non-Asian Students.—Outcomes of Success for All non-Asian students were also very positive in grades 3-5. Experimental-control differences were statistically significant ($p<.05$ or better) on every measure at every level. Effect sizes were somewhat smaller than for Asian students, but were still quite substantial, average +1.00 in grade, +0.96 in grade 4, and +0.78 in grade 5. Success for All students averaged almost two years above grade level in third grade, more than a year above grade level in fourth grade, and about eight months above grade level in fifth grade; at all grade levels, Success for All averaged about 2.5 years higher than control students.

Fairhill (Bilingual)—The bilingual version of Success for All, Lee Connigo, was first implemented at Fairhill Elementary School, a school in inner-city Philadelphia. Fairhill serves a student body of 694 students of whom 78% are Hispanic and 22% are African-American. A matched comparison school was also selected. Nearly all students in both schools qualified for free lunches. Both

schools were Title I schoolwide projects, which means that both had high (and roughly equivalent) allocations of Title I funds that they could use flexibly to meet student needs.

Results: All students defined by district criteria as limited English proficient at Fairhill and its control school were pretested at the beginning of first grade on the Spanish Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT). Each following May, these students were tested by native language speakers on three scales of the Spanish Woodcock.

ANCOVAs controlling for pretests showed that at the end of grade 2 Success for All students scored substantially higher than control on every measure ($p<.01$ or better). Control second-graders scored far below grade level on all three scales. In contrast, Fairhill students averaged near grade level on all measures. Effect sizes on all measures were substantial. Fairhill students exceeded control by 1.8 standard deviations on Letter-Word Identification, 2.2 on Word Attack, and 1.3 on Passage Comprehension. Fremont (Bilingual), Wright (Bilingual) and El Vista (ESL).

Data from first-graders in three California Success for All schools were analyzed together by Dianda and Flaherty (1995), pooling data across schools in four categories: English-dominant students, Spanish-dominant students taught in Spanish (Lee Connigo in Success for All schools), Spanish-dominant students taught in English ("sheltered students"), and speakers of languages other than English or Spanish taught in English. The pooled results are summarized in Figure 5.

As is clear in Figure 5, all categories of Success for All students scored substantially better than control students. The differences were greatest, however, for Spanish-dominated students taught in bilingual classes ($ES=+1.03$) and those taught in sheltered English programs ($ES=+1.02$). The bilingual students scored at grade level, and more than six months ahead of controls. The sheltered students scored about two months below grade level, but were still four months ahead of their controls. Both English-speaking students and speakers of languages other than English or Spanish scored above grade level and about two months ahead of their controls. The effects of Success for All on the achievement of English language learners are substantially positive. Across three schools implementing Lee Connigo, the Spanish curriculum used in bilingual Success for All schools, the average effect size for first-graders on Spanish assessments was +0.88; for second-graders (at Philadelphia's Fairhill Elementary) the average effect size was +1.77. For students in sheltered English instruction, effect sizes for all comparisons were also very positive, especially for Cambodian students in Philadelphia and Mexican-American students in California.

Comparing Success for All and Reading Recovery

Reading Recovery is one of the most extensively researched and widely used innovations in elementary education. Like Success for All, Reading Recovery provides one-to-one tutoring to first graders who are struggling in reading. Research on Reading Recovery has found substantial positive effects of the program as of the end of first grade, and longitudinal studies have found that some portion of these effects maintain at least through fourth grade (DeFord, Pinnell, Lyons & Young, 1988; Pinnell, Lyons, DeFord, Bryk, & Seltzer, 1991).

Schools and districts attracted to Success for All are also often attracted to Reading Recovery, as the two programs share an emphasis on early intervention and a strong research base. Increasing numbers of districts

have both programs in operation in different schools. One of the districts in the Success for All evaluation, Caldwell, Idaho, happened to be one of these. Ross, Smith, Casey, & Slavin (1995) used this opportunity to compare the two programs.

In Caldwell, two schools are using Success for All and one is using Reading Recovery. All three are very similar rural schools with similar ethnic make-ups (10-25% Hispanic, with the remainder Anglo), proportions of students qualifying for free lunch (45-60%), and sizes (411-451). The Success for All schools were somewhat higher than the Reading Recovery school in poverty and percent Hispanic. In 1992-93, one of the Success for All schools was in its second year of implementation and the other was a new school that was in its first year (but had moved a principal and some experienced staff reassigned from the first school). Reading Recovery was in its second year of implementation.

The study compared first-graders in the three schools. Figure 6 summarizes the results. As is clear from the figure, students in the Success for All schools performed somewhat better than students in the Reading Recovery school overall ($ES=+.17$). Differences for special education students were substantial, averaging an effect size of $+.77$. Special education students were not tutored in the Reading Recovery school and were primarily taught in a separate resource room. These students scored near the floor on all tests. In contrast, Success for All special education students were fully mainstreamed and did receive tutoring, and their reading scores, though still low, showed them to be on the way toward success in reading.

Excluding the special education students, there were no differences in reading performance between tutored students in the Success for All and Reading Recovery schools ($ES=.00$). In light of earlier research, these outcomes suggest that both tutoring programs are highly effective for at-risk first graders.

A second comparison of Success for All and Reading Recovery was carried out by Ross, Nunnery, & Smith (1996) in the Amphitheater School District of Tucson, Arizona. Three high-poverty schools (about 25% Mexican American students) were compared. One used Success for All, one used Reading Recovery with a whole-language curriculum, and a control school used a whole-language approach without tutoring.

In this study, tutored as well as non-tutored first-graders scored substantially higher in Success for All than in Reading Recovery. For tutored students the difference averaged an effect size of 1.08, with mean grade equivalents of 1.85 for tutored students in Success for All, 1.20 for Reading Recovery students. For all students, Success for All students had an average grade equivalent of 2.18, the Reading Recovery school 1.73, and the control school 1.80, with mean effect sizes of $+.68$ comparing Success for All and the Reading Recovery school and $+.39$ comparing Success for All and control.

The comparison of Success for All and Reading Recovery supports a common-sense conclusion. Success for All, which affects all students, has positive effects on all students. Reading Recovery focuses on tutoring and therefore produces its effects only on tutored students. These results suggest that Success for All may be most appropriate in schools serving many at-risk students, while Reading Recovery may be more practical when the number of students at risk of reading failure is small. Some schools have merged the two programs, combining the breadth and comprehensiveness of Success for All with the outstanding professional development for tutors provided by Reading Recov-

ery. Such mergers of Success for All and Reading Recovery are being started in about a dozen schools located around the United States.

Success for All and Special Education

Perhaps the most important goal of Success for All is to place a floor under the reading achievement of all children, to ensure that every child performs adequately in this critical skill. This goal has major implications for special education. If the program makes a substantial difference in the reading achievement of the lowest achievers, then it should reduce special education referrals and placements. Further, students who have IEPs indicating learning disabilities or related problems are typically treated the same as other students in Success for All. That is, they receive tutoring if they need it, participate in reading classes appropriate to their reading levels, and spend the rest of the day in age-appropriate, heterogeneous home-rooms. Their tutor and/or reading teacher is likely to be a special education teacher, but otherwise they are not treated differently.

The philosophy behind that treatment of special education issues in Success for All is called "neverstreaming" (Slavin et al. 1991). That is, rather than waiting until students fall far behind, are assigned to special education, and then may be mainstreamed into regular classes, Success for All schools intervene early and intensively with students who are at risk to try to keep them out of the special education system. Once students are far behind, special education services are unlikely to catch them up to age-appropriate levels of performance. Students who have already failed in reading are likely to have an overlay of anxiety, poor motivation, poor behavior, low self-esteem, and ineffective learning strategies that are likely to interfere with learning no matter how good special education services may be. Ensuring that all students succeed in the first place is a far better strategy if it can be accomplished. In Success for All, the provision of research-based preschool, kindergarten, and first grade reading, one-to-one tutoring, and family support services are likely to give the most at-risk students a good chance of developing enough reading skills to remain out of special education, or to perform better in special education than would have otherwise been the case.

That data relating to special education outcomes clearly support these expectations. Several studies have focused on questions related to special education. One of the most important outcomes in this area is the consistent finding of particularly large effects of Success for All for students in the lowest 25% of their classes. While effect sizes for students in general have averaged around $+0.50$ on individually administered reading measures, effect sizes for the lowest achievers have averaged in the range of $+1.00$ to $+1.50$ across the grades. Across five Baltimore schools, only 2.2% of third-graders averaged two years behind grade level, a usual criterion for special education placement. In contrast, 8.8% of control third-graders scored this poorly. Baltimore data have also shown a reduction in special education placements for learning disabilities of about half (Slavin et al., 1992). A study of two Success for All schools in Ft. Wayne, Indiana found that over a two year period 3.2% of Success for All students in grades K-1 and 1-2 were referred to special education for learning disabilities or mild mental handicaps. In contrast, 14.3% of control students were referred in these categories (Smith, Ross, & Casey, 1994).

Taken together, these findings support the conclusion that Success for All both reduces the need for special education services (by

raising the reading achievement of very low achievers) and reduces special education referrals and placements.

Another important question concerns the effects of the program on students who have already been assigned to special education. Here again, there is evidence from different sources. In the Ross et al. (1995) study comparing Reading Recovery and Success for All described above, it so happened that first-graders in special education in the Reading Recovery group were not tutored, but instead received traditional special education services in resource rooms. In the Success for All schools, first-graders who had been assigned to special education were tutored one-to-one (by their special education teachers) and otherwise participated in the program in the same way as all other students. As noted earlier (recall Figure 6), special education students in Success for All were reading substantially better ($ES=+.77$) than special education students in the comparison school. In addition, Smith et al. (1994) combined first grade reading data from special education students in Success for All and control schools in four districts: Memphis, Ft. Wayne, Indiana, Montgomery, Alabama, and Caldwell, Idaho). Success for All special education students scored substantially better than controls (mean $ES=+.59$).

CONCLUSION

The results of evaluations of twenty-three Success for All schools in nine districts in eight states clearly show that the program increases student reading performance. In every district, Success for All students learned significantly more than matched control students. Significant effects were not seen on every measure at every grade level, but the consistent direction and magnitude of the effects show unequivocal benefits for Success for All students. Effects on district-administered standardized tests reinforce the findings of the studies using individually administered tests. This report also adds evidence showing particularly large impacts on the achievement of limited English proficient students in both bilingual and ESL programs, and on both reducing special education referrals and improving the achievement of students who have been assigned to special education. It compares the outcomes of Success for All with those of another early intervention program, Reading Recovery. It also summarizes outcomes of Roots and Wings, the next stage in the development of Success for All.

The Success for All evaluations have used reliable and valid measures, individually administered tests that are sensitive to all aspects of reading—comprehension, fluency, word attack, and word identification. Performance of Success for All students has been compared to that of matched students in matched control schools, who provide the best indication of what students without the program would have achieved. Replication of high-quality experiments in such a wide variety of schools and districts is extremely unusual. The equally consistent and dramatic impact of Success for All and Roots and Wings on district standardized tests and state performance assessments are further evidence of the broad impact of these programs.

An important indicator of the robustness of Success for All is the fact of the more than 300 schools that have used the program for periods of 1-8 years, only eight have dropped out (in all cases because of changes of principals). Many other Success for All schools have survived changes of superintendents, principals, facilitators, and other key staff, major cuts in funding, and other serious threats to program maintenance.

The research summarized here demonstrates that comprehensive, systemic

school-by-school change can take place on a broad scale in a way that maintains the integrity and effectiveness of the model. The 23 schools in nine districts that we are studying in depth are typical of the larger set of schools currently using Success for All and Roots and Wings in terms of quality of implementation, resources, demographic characteristics, and other factors. Program outcomes are not limited to the original home of the program; in fact, outcomes tend to be somewhat better outside of Baltimore. The widely held idea based on the Rand study of innovation (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; McLaughlin, 1990) that comprehensive school reform must be invented by school staffs themselves is certainly not supported in research on Success for All or Roots and Wings. While the program is adapted to meet the needs of each school, and while school staffs must agree to implement the program by a vote of 80 percent or more, Success for All and Roots and Wings are externally developed programs with specific materials, manuals, and structures. The observation that these programs can be implemented and maintained over considerable time periods and can be effective in each of their replication sites certainly supports the idea that every school staff need not reinvent the wheel.

There is nothing magic about Success for All or Roots and Wings. None of their components are completely new or unique. Obviously, schools serving disadvantaged students can have great success without a special program if they have an outstanding staff, and other prevention/early intervention models, such as Reading Recovery (Pinnell, 1989) and the School Development Program (Comer, 1988) also have evidence of effectiveness with disadvantaged children. The main importance of the research on Success for All and Roots and Wings is not in validating a particular model or in demonstrating that disadvantaged students can learn. Rather, its greatest importance is in demonstrating that success for disadvantaged students can be routinely ensured in schools that are not exceptional or extraordinary (and were not producing great success before the program was introduced). We cannot ensure that every school has a charismatic principal or every student has a charismatic teacher. Nevertheless, we can ensure that every child, regardless of family background, has an opportunity to succeed in school.

The demonstration that an effective program can be replicated and can be effective in its replication sites removes one more excuse for the continuing low achievement of disadvantaged children. In order to ensure the success of disadvantaged students we must have the political commitment to do so, with the funds and policies to back up this commitment. Success for All and Roots and Wings do require a serious commitment to restructure elementary schools and to reconfigure uses of Title I, special education, and other funds to emphasize prevention and early intervention rather than remediation. These and other systemic changes in assessments, accountability, standards, and legislation can facilitate the implementation of Success for All, Roots and Wings, and other school reform programs. However, we must also have methods known not only to be effective in their original sites, but also to be replicable and effective in other sites. The evaluations presented in this report provide a practical demonstration of the effectiveness and replicability of one such program.

REFERENCES

- Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change: A model of education change. Vol. VIII: Implementing and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Comer, J. (1988). Educating poor minority children. *Scientific American*, 259, 42-48.
- DeFord, D.E., Pinnell, G.S., Lyons, C.A., & Young, P. (1987). Ohio's Reading Recovery program: Vol. VII, Report of the follow-up studies. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.
- Dianda, M.R., & Flaherty, J.F. (April 1995). Effects of Success for All on the reading achievement of first graders in California bilingual programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Dianda, M.R., Madden, N.A., & Slavin, R.E. (1993, April). Lee Connigo: Success for All in schools serving limited English proficient students. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta.
- Garcia, E.E. (1991). Bilingualism, second language acquisition, and the education of Chicano language minority students. In R.R. Valencia (Ed.), *Chicano school failure and success: Research and policy agendas for the 1990's*. New York: Falmer.
- Garica, E.E. (1994, April). The impact of linguistic and cultural diversity on America's schools: A need for new policy. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- GAO. 1994. Limited English proficiency: A growing and costly educational challenge facing many school districts. Washington, DC: United States General Accounting Office.
- Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., Ivory, G., & Calderón, M. (1993). The Bilingual Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (BCIRC) project in the Ysleta Independent School District: Standardized test outcomes. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.
- Horwitz, R.I. (1987). Complexity and contradiction in clinical trial research. *American Journal of Medicine*, 82, 498-510.
- Levin, H.M. (1987). Accelerated schools for disadvantaged students. *Educational Leadership*, 44 (6), 19-21.
- Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L.J., & Wasik, B.A. (1993). Success for All: Longitudinal effects of a restructuring program for inner-city elementary schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30, 123-148.
- Matt, G.E., & Cook, T.D. (1994). Threats to the validity of research and syntheses. In H. Cooper & L.V. Hedges (Eds.), *The handbook of research synthesis* (pp. 503-520). New York: Russell Sage.
- McLaughlin, M.W. (1990). The Rand change agent study revisited: Macro perspectives and micro realities. *Educational Researcher*, 19(9), 11-16.
- Pinnell, G.S. (1989). Reading Recovery: Helping at-risk children learn to read. *Elementary School Journal*, 90, 161-182.
- Pinnell, G.S., Lyons, C.A., DeFord, D.E., Bryk, A.S., & Seltzer, M. (1994). Comparing instructional models for the literacy education of high risk first graders. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 29, 8-38.
- Pinnell, G.S., Lyons, C.A., DeFord, D.E., Bryk, A.S., & Seltzer, M. (1991). Studying the effectiveness of early intervention approaches for first grade children having difficulty in reading. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Martha L. King Language and Literacy Center.
- Ross, S.M., Nunnery, J., & Smith, L. (1996). Evaluation of Title I reading programs: Amphitheater Public Schools. Year 1: 1995-96. Memphis: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.
- Ross, S.M., Smith, L.J., Casey, J., Johnson, B., & Bond, C. (1994, April). Using "Success for All" to restructure elementary schools: A tale of four cities. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Ross, S.M., Smith, L.J., Casey, J., & Slavin, R.E. (1995). Increasing the academic success of disadvantaged children: An examination of alternative early intervention programs. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, 773-800.
- Sizer, T. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Slavin, R.E. (1986) Best-evidence synthesis: An alternative to meta-analytic and traditional reviews. *Education Researcher*, 15(9), 5-11.
- Slavin, R.E. (1987). Ability grouping and student achievement in elementary schools: A best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 57, 347-350.
- Slavin, R.E. (1994). School and classroom organization in beginning reading: Class size, aides, and instructional grouping. In R.E. Slavin, N.L. Karweit, B.A. Wasik, & N.A. Madden (Eds.), *Preventing early school failure: Research on effective strategies*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Slavin, R.E. (1995). Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice (2nd Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., & Wasik, B.A. (1992/93). Preventing early school failure: What works? *Educational Leadership*, 50(4), 10-18.
- Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., & Wasik, B.A. (1994). Preventing early school failure: Research on effective strategies. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (1993, April). Multi-site replicated experiments: An application to Success for All. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta.
- Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (1994). Implementing Success for All in the Philadelphia Public Schools (Final report to the Pew Charitable Trusts). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.
- Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (1995, April). Effects of Success for All on the Achievement of English language learners. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B.A. (1992). Success for All: A relentless approach to prevention and early intervention in elementary schools. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B.A. (1996b). Every child, every school: Success for All. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.
- Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., Wasik, B.A., Ross, S.M., & Smith, L.J. (1994). "Whenever and wherever we choose . . ." The replication of Success for All. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75(8), 639-647.
- Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., Wasik, B.A., Ross, S.M., & Smith, L.J. (1994, April). Success for All: Longitudinal effects of systemic school-by-school reform in seven districts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., Wasik, B.A., Ross, S.M., Smith, L.J., & Dianda, M. (1996a). Success for All: A summary of research. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 1 (1), 41-76.
- Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., Wasik, B.A., Shaw, A., Mainzer, K.L., & Haxby B. (1991). Neverstreaming: Prevention and early intervention as alternatives to special education. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 24, 373-378.
- Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., & Stevens, R.J. (1989/90). Cooperative learning models for the 3 Rs. *Educational Leadership*, 47 (4), 22-28.
- Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., & Wasik, B.A. (1996). Roots and Wings. In S. Stringfield S. Ross, & L. Smith (Eds.), *Bold plans for school restructuring: The New American Schools Designs*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Slavin, R.E., & Yampolsky, R. (1991). Effects of Success for All on students with limited English proficiency: A three-year evaluation. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.
- Smith, L.J., Ross, S.M., & Casey, J.P. (1994). Special education analyses for Success for All in four cities. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.
- Stevens, R.J., Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., & Farnish, A.M. (1987). Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition: Two field experiments. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 22, 433-454.
- Wasik, B.A., & Slavin, R.E. (1993). Preventing early reading failure with one-to-one tutoring: A review of five programs. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 28, 178-200.
- Willig, A.C. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. *Review of Educational Research*, 55, 269-317.
- Wongbunhit, Y. (1995). Evaluation of Success for All in the Dade County Public Schools. Miami: Dade County Public Schools.
- Wong-Fillmore, L., & Valadez, C. (1986). Teaching bilingual learners. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd Ed.). New York: Macmillan.

MODERN RED SCHOOLHOUSE ON THE WORLD-WIDE WEB

(A project of Hudson Institute)

PREFACE

The little red schoolhouse of yesteryear, at least as idealized in American memory, was an institution that drew people together for

common purposes, to share in one of the most important responsibilities of any community: readying the next generation to take its place in that community by socializing the young, transmitting the culture, and equipping future workers, citizens, and parents with essential knowledge, skills, and habits. The Modern Red Schoolhouse intends to reinvent some of the key virtues of the little red schoolhouse in a modern context and with a modern mission to be a place where all children will learn and achieve academic standards that are truly world class.

This is not to say that all children will learn in the same way, or at the same time, or at the same pace. To this challenge, Modern Red Schoolhouse offers a set of teaching methods tailored to identify and nurture the potential that exists in every child. The Modern Red Schoolhouse standards are high. But they come with the expectation that all children will be afforded many routes towards their attainment. Like its nineteenth-century namesake, the Modern Red Schoolhouse does not lose sight of the fact that mastery of subject matter is the only acceptable goal for all children, wherever they may come from and however they may learn.

The standards documented here will be met by Modern Red Schoolhouse students in eight core subjects defined as English language arts, geography, history, mathematics, science, the arts, foreign languages, and health and physical education. The Modern Red Schoolhouse curriculum consists of Hudson Units both Foundation Units and Capstone Units. Foundation Units are developed or selected at each school for the primary purpose of instruction, although Foundation Units also include some built-in assessment. Capstone Units are developed by Advanced Systems, Inc., assessment contractor for the Modern Red Schoolhouse, in collaboration with teachers at cooperating schools. Their primary purpose is to assess students' academic progress, but because they are integral to curriculum, they also include some built-in instruction. Schools will arrange a series of Hudson Units to meet the individual learning needs of each student. All the performance objectives of all the Hudson Units successfully completed by each student will lead that student to achievement of the standards. All the Capstone Units, supplemented by examinations in each subject, form a Watershed Assessment of the standards which signal students' readiness to move to the next level of schooling.

All Modern Red Schoolhouse students are expected to meet the standards that follow with a few modest qualifications. The foreign language standards assume that students will become proficient speakers of two languages: English and one other. This does not preclude students from pursuing study of a third language; in fact, they are encouraged to do so. The arts encompass three arts disciplines: visual arts, music, and drama. Students are expected to meet standards for all three through the intermediate level. Advanced level students will achieve the advanced standards for one arts discipline of the student's own choosing.

The Modern Red Schoolhouse standards are the result of two years of the combined thinking of teachers, administrators, community members, and national subject specialists. During the design phase, representatives of participating school districts began to identify high standards in eight core subjects. The College Board's Advanced Placement standards were used as an initial benchmark to help participants articulate what students should know and be able to do at the time of graduation from high school. Although students in the Modern Red Schoolhouse will reach these standards at

different rates and therefore at different ages, the three levels are roughly equivalent to what students should know and be able to do at the end of grades 4, 8, and 12.

Successive drafts of the standards were reviewed by the Modern Red Schoolhouse Standards and Assessment Task Force. This document is the result of considerable revision by a team of subject specialists, all with broad experience in setting high standards and helping students to achieve them. Their joint experience includes work for the Advanced Placement program, the Council for Basic Education, the National Council of Teachers of English, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Mathematical Association of America, the National Science Teachers Association, and a combined hundred years in classrooms at all levels. Drafts of the standards have been reviewed by subject specialists at Advanced Systems, Inc. and teachers in member schools, whose suggestions have prompted additional revisions. The greatest challenge offered by these standards raising student achievement to meet them will be addressed through innovative curriculum and not by lowered expectations.

While the Modern Red Schoolhouse standards are unique, they are not inconsistent with the recommendations of professional associations striving for excellence in education. We have borrowed heavily from other sets of standards developed in recent years in the great national effort to reform America's schools. We are indebted to the work of the National Assessment Governing Board whose National Assessments of Educational Progress in language arts, geography, mathematics, science, and the arts helped inform the standards. We drew from the College Board's various teacher's guides to their Advanced Placement courses. Publications from the following professional associations informed the development of the standards in their respective disciplines: the Association of American Geographers, the Bradley Commission on History in Schools; the National Center for History in the Schools (UCLA-NEH); the National Council for Teachers of Mathematics; the American Association for the Advancement of Science; National Standards in Foreign Language Education project; and the National Association for Sports and Physical Education.

In addition to these, the standards have been informed by the U.S. Department of Education's "James Madison" series and the U.S. Department of Labor's SCANS reports. Standards for the primary and intermediate levels were also informed by E.D. Hirsch's "Cultural Literacy" inventory and Smart Start by Patte Barth and Ruth Mitchell.

We are indebted especially to the work of the following authors and associations:

In English language arts:
Barth, P. and R. Mitchell. *Smart Start*. North American Press, 1992.

Gadda, G., E. Jensen, F. McQuade, and H. Wilson. *Teacher's Guide to Advanced Placement Courses in English Language and Composition*. The College Board, 1985.

McQuade, F. *Teacher's Guide to Advanced Placement Courses in English Literature and Composition*. The College Board, 1993.

Reading Framework for the 1992 and 1994 National Assessment of Educational Progress. National Assessment Governing Board, U.S. Dept. of Education.

Reading and Thinking: A New Framework for Comprehension. Massachusetts Department of Education, 1987.

Writing Framework for the 1992 National Assessment of Educational Progress. National Assessment Governing Board, U.S. Dept. of Education.

In Geography:
Geography Framework for the 1992 and 1994 National Assessment of Educational Progress. U.S. Dept. of Education, 1992.

Geography (K-6 and 7-12): Themes, Key Ideas, and Learning Opportunities. Geography Education National Implementation Project, 1989.

Guidelines for Geographic Education. Association of American Geographers, 1984.

In History:
Historical Literacy. Bradley Commission on History in the Schools, 1989.

History-Social Science Framework. California Department of Education, 1988.

Holt, T. *Thinking Historically*. The College Board, 1990.

National History Standards Project. National Center for History in the Schools, UCLA-NEH Research Program, ongoing.

In Mathematics:
Edwards, E.L. *Algebra for Everyone*. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1990.

Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Mathematics. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1989.

Mathematics Assessment: 1994 National Assessment of Educational Progress. Submitted to the National Assessment Governing Board by The College Board, 1992.

Meiring, S.P., R.N. Rubenstein, J.E. Schultz, J. de Lange, and D.L. Chambers. *A Core Curriculum: Making Mathematics Count for Everyone: Addenda Series, Grades 9-12*. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1992.

Silver, E., J. Kilpatrick, and B. Schlesinger. *Thinking through Mathematics: Fostering Inquiry and Communication in Mathematics Classrooms*. The College Board, 1990.

In Science:
Fulfilling the Promise: Biology Education in the Nation's Schools. National Research Council, 1991.

National Committee on Science Education Standards and Assessment. National Research Council, 1993 (draft).

Project 2061: Science for all Americans. American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1989.

Science Framework for the 1994 National Assessment of Educational Progress. National Assessment Governing Board, U.S. Dept. of Education.

Science and Technology Education for the Elementary Years. National Center for Improving Science Education, 1989.

Scope, Sequence, and Coordination of Secondary School Science. The Content Core: A Guide for Curriculum Designers. National Science Teachers Association, 1986.

The Modern Red Schoolhouse has also integrated character education into the academic curriculum of its students. In his essay "Character Education in Our Schools" (published separately by Modern Red Schoolhouse), Kevin Ryan of Boston University discusses the need for character education and the attempt by the Modern Red Schoolhouse to effectively address this issue. However, discussions about dealing with this subject are best made with the community. Therefore, individual schools are advised to develop their character education programs with the help and guidance of the school's parents and communities. In preparing the curriculum, especially in health and physical education, we encourage educators to review not only the standards enumerated here, but also Kevin Ryan's essay. It discusses in more detail the reasons for character education and the specific goals of the Modern Red Schoolhouse program. This essay can be obtained separately from the Hudson Institute.

The Modern Red Schoolhouse standards are anchored in beliefs and principles that most Americans today as they did a century ago know to be true and valid. We believe that standards can serve as an anchor for those principles while at the same time preparing graduates to take their place in the communities of the twenty-first century.

SALLY B. KILGORE, Ph.D.,

Director.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

With all due respect to the colloquy that just occurred, this funding cannot be used to provide gifted and talented funding. The purpose of title I under which this program is funded is to promote the raising of standards in schools and the raising of performance by improving the performance of disadvantaged children. There is a separate program for gifted and talented. We cannot use an exchange between two Members to rewrite what, in fact, is the basic authorization, irrespective of their efforts to do so.

I would also point out with respect to Comer schools, people can have whatever ideological reaction they want to it. The key element in Comer schools is family involvement, parental involvement, and often not just with your own child but deep involvement in the operation of the school itself and collaborative decisionmaking so that you do not have an additional round of finger pointing every time a problem develops at school, to emphasize forcing people to work together to make collective decisions which everybody takes their fair share of responsibility for.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I do not follow the comments of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] because it seems to me perfectly plausible that a poor and educationally disadvantaged child could also be gifted and talented.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH].

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, let me clarify. It was not my intention to say this program could be used for a separate program, the Jacob Javits program, but under title I we could have students who are participating in a gifted and talented educational program and they would not be excluded from this simply because it is not expressly mentioned.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman will yield, I was just explaining to several of the gentleman's Members, one of these models involves taking so-called slow learners, and instead of dealing with them by putting them in remediation programs, it deals with them by in fact putting them in highly advanced intensive programs, much as you would a gifted and talented student. That is totally counterintuitive to me. But the evaluation of those programs demonstrates that it has produced some very dramatic results with those kids. In that sense, what the gentleman is saying might have some relevance to the situation, I would grant that.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, the point I would just like to make is that someone does not have to be labeled "disadvantaged." They simply have to meet the requirements for title I. They do not have to be labeled as "slow learners" to be shifted into that highly talented program. They could be gifted and talented students who are eligible for title I programs.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman will yield further, we have not just made the funds available to title I schools, we have made \$50 million of this available to non-title-I schools, because we think that all schools will be interested in this, not just schools that have a high percentage of disadvantaged students.

□ 1545

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to reiterate an important point that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] made that bears mentioning to our colleagues.

Again, we are talking about \$200 million, which is the subject of the en bloc amendment. Of that amount, \$50 million is actually for grants to local education agencies. That is money that, just as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] suggested, is being driven down to the local level.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I think if we had more debate like this, I find this very refreshing, I think we are talking to issues, we are talking about education, we are not talking about politics. I would like to thank Members on both sides.

In the 104th Congress, as chairman of a subcommittee basically responsible for K through 12 education, we had several hearings. One of those hearings, or all five of the hearings in one area, showed that our children were not competing for entry level jobs. The fact is that they could not read, they could not write, they could not speak the English language, or did not have the high-technical skills available.

In my own district, there are two gentlemen, both immigrants. One is named Paul Ecker who donates large amounts of money and his passion is education, as is a Hispanic friend of mine, Ralph Pesquera, recently tasked to look at education on school entrance into college. The sad thing is many of those students were not prepared to meet the college level education. Many of us feel that more of the resources should be focused on the lower levels instead of so much on the higher levels. Again, I think that is why this debate is very refreshing.

Mr. Chairman, when we talk about things that we would like to look at in school reform, the President asked for \$3 billion in a literacy program.

Currently, we have 14 Federal literacy programs. Mr. HOEKSTRA and the gentleman from California, [Mr. RIGGS], are looking into saying, well, I think it is reasonable for both sides of the aisle to say, let's find one or two that really work and let's fully fund them in the public schools and make sure we get the resources and the funds available for those and eliminate the bureaucracy, without saying, hey, we are cutting education but actually enhancing education because we are getting more money down to the level.

I think that reform is very important.

Damaging public education, I think, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], if we get into a fight, public versus private, I think we both lose. I think the whole value is taking our public schools with the problems that many of them have, and looking to bring them up to private level standards across the board.

Not all private schools are that good, either. But many of them you go to, you see the parents, the teachers, the children all lauding each other. Go to public schools across the Nation and in many of those public schools we do not see that.

My wife has a doctorate degree in education. She is an elementary school principal with two schools. You think somebody works hard? A good night for her is when she gets out at 9 or 10 o'clock. She is a very good principal. She has dedicated teachers. Yet, in our State of California we have just slipped from 45 to 50 in literacy.

Now, this is a nation where we have large amounts of resources that we do not apply. We have less than 12 percent of our schools that have even a single phone jack. We have so many Federal programs and get so little of the money. The average is 48 cents; in some States 23 cents. We need also in this reform to look to be able to focus the majority of money down to the ZIP Code, and where the parents and the teachers and the families can have a better say of what that education is.

Again, I would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS]. This is one of the better debates that I think has occurred and a debate we can be proud of on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished ranking member for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the agreement worked out. Individual schools that elect to participate in this program identify an effective research-based whole school reform model that has the support of their community.

In my district in Cleveland, OH, eight schools are using the Comer reform model. This model involves shared decisionmaking, focuses on parental involvement, and includes student-staff-support team. Together, these teams develop the policies that are used to guide the school.

The Comer model has been used in Cleveland since 1990, and includes seven elementary and one middle school. Plans are under way to expand the use of this concept to a high school.

The Cleveland effort is a collaborative partnership with the Harvard Business School alumni that live in Cleveland, the Applewood Center,

Cleveland public schools, the community, and Cleveland State University.

In my district, the Comer model has been successful in that it has changed the climate of the participating schools. It has made the schools more friendly to parents, a better place for teachers to work, and, in turn, a better place for students to learn.

Cleveland State University has provided staff development and training for teachers and parents in the Comer program-participating schools and has helped to implement the Comer model. Cleveland State University is now involved in helping to measure and evaluate the projects, and to examine how the program can best be replicated.

With respect to gains in academic achievement, seven of the eight Comer program-participating schools have shown improvements in students' achievement and/or attendance.

With respect to the State proficiency test, there is now definite evidence that students in the Comer model school improved performance. This is especially good to be noted because in many of the other schools, young people taking the State proficiency test have been unable to pass that test, particularly in the fourth and eighth grades where they are taking tests in math and reading.

So the whole school reform program is a success for communities that wanted to improve their schools, and I support the agreement that has been worked out between both sides on a bipartisan basis.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman and the chairman of the committee for working out this agreement. This will enable those school districts who are truly interested in not only reforming their districts but providing improved results for their students an opportunity to draw upon the best programs that we have in this Nation with the best research and, to date, the best outcomes.

I have a school in my own district, Peres School in the city of Richmond, that had invited in the John Hopkins program, Success For All, the Wings and Roots program, and redesigned a school that serves the poorest children in my district. Not only is this program hopefully going to provide better results for these children, but it also provided a means of a circuit breaker from just doing the same old thing that has failed these children year in and year out.

As the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Obey] pointed out earlier, it had to be done by bringing the teachers, bringing the administrators, the school board, together to vote in an 80 percent ratio in favor of going in this direction. Those teachers who felt that they

could not do it or did not want to do it were able to go to another school they were more comfortable with for whatever reason. But they have put together a team and are heading in the same direction.

It is very much like when you have a football program at the high school. You try to get the freshman squad and the junior varsity squad and the varsity squad heading in the same direction so they are able to understand what is taking place, instead of having a lot of ad hoc programs started based upon somebody's notion of what works or what will succeed or what will not.

Here we will have hard research. This is a bottoms up approach. They were invited in by the Richmond school district, by the parents, to see if they could help.

I notice that our State Department of Education has invited in four schools to take a look at all of these programs this last summer, to let them explain where they might be helpful and let the districts pick that which they think is the best fit for them. But, again, the common element is a strong research as to the effectiveness of these programs, parental involvement, and a new commitment, a new commitment to excellence by both parents and teachers.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Ford].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to thank again the distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Obey], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Porter], and even the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Livingston], and all of those who worked on this amendment, and my dear friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. Riggs].

Mr. Chairman, I would say I rise in support of the agreement that has been reached. The whole school reform effort, as we have heard from Members attesting today, has had a profound and, in many ways, enormous positive impact on districts throughout this Nation.

I speak with personal point from the Ninth District in Tennessee, at Charjean Elementary, principaled by Ms. King, and certainly Manor Lake by Mr. Woladin, and Mr. Harrison at Dunn Elementary. They have experienced tremendous success using the Success for All model, resulting in improved reading scores and math scores, and even parental involvement from parents throughout the community.

One of the great things about the whole school reform initiative, Mr. Chairman, and I say this to my dear colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Riggs], is that it empowers teachers and certainly school administrators and parents, and it incorporates high standards, and at the same time that it provides us all autonomy, it also calls for more accountability.

So I applaud the agreement that has been reached, and would certainly say

we are well on our way to preparing a new generation of workers, a new generation of scientists and astronauts, and those who will help lead this great Nation into the next millennium.

Again, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Obey], the gentleman from California [Mr. Riggs], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Porter], for their leadership on this issue and other educational matters.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Porter], the chairman of the committee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say that as a Representative of Illinois with a district very close to the city of Chicago, I have seen, and continue to see, comprehensive school reform like perhaps no other in the history of this country.

Last year, the Illinois General Assembly, a Republican body, and a Republican Governor, said we have seen years and years and years of entrenched bureaucracies in the city of Chicago school system, overbloomed with personnel, no standards, nothing happening to serve the children, and we are simply going to abolish the Chicago school board. They put the mayor of the city of Chicago, Richard J. Daley, in charge of the Chicago school system.

The mayor of Chicago took charge of that school system, and if you want to see comprehensive school reform happening in a big city and a school system being turned around, you want to look at Chicago.

Social advancement was gone in 1 day; accountability became "in" immediately; innovation, parental involvement, standards for students, standards for teachers, discipline, kicking out the druggies and the people that bring weapons on to school property, all were implemented.

We are seeing the kind of comprehensive school reform in Chicago that ought to happen in all of the systems in this country where the kids are not performing up to standards and where we can do much, much better.

Mr. Chairman, I went to a conference very early this year, and listened to Professor Comer of Yale and others, and was very intrigued with this concept that he was talking about.

When the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Obey] suggested that this ought to be a part of this bill, I thought he is exactly right. We can perhaps give some resources to school systems that do not have them, and encourage them to do the kind of thing that is being done in the city of Chicago to make a system work for the kids and raise our standards.

So I would compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Obey], with whom I work very closely, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Goodling], the gentleman from California [Mr. Riggs], and the gentlewoman from Kentucky [Mrs. Northup]. This is a good concept. It is going to work

well. It is going to help change school systems that are dysfunctional into ones that really work for the American children. I think this is a very, very good reform.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

□ 1600

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that I would like to also compliment the chairman of the subcommittee for being open-minded enough to review these proposals and to recognize that this offers us an opportunity for a non-ideological way to get at school reform.

I also appreciate the constructive efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], the education authorizing committee chair, for his efforts, to see to it that we can proceed on a project that will help raise school performance and school standards around the country.

I think we underestimate often what our kids can do if they are challenged and if the schools in which they learn are imaginative enough and well organized enough. I hope this initiative will lead to that day.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to point out that again this has been, I think, a very genuine, good-faith effort at bipartisan compromise. Perhaps whole school reform, as it is now modified to mean comprehensive school reform, will do some good. At least \$50 million of the \$200 million is being driven down right to the local level, block-granted or not block-granted, but in grants to local school districts.

However, I want to make it clear, I do not quite share this enthusiasm for the whole school reform model. I personally am a little wary, as the chairman of the authorizing subcommittee, of the reform de jour in education. Somebody always has a better idea; we are going to come up with a panacea to solve our educational woes in America today, to improve and bootstrap reform at the local school district level.

But if it were up to me, if I could play the benevolent dictator for a day, I would leave those tax dollars in the local communities. I would let local taxpayers and local elected educational decisionmakers decide how to spend that money, rather than have to have it sent to Washington, recycled through the bureaucracy. And let us be honest about it here, we have a large bureaucracy here in Washington, the Department of Education. We have bureaucracies in the State houses, the State capitols around the country that siphon off so much money.

We heard the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] talk about half, and I actually think it was less than 50 cents, or 50 percent of every dollar, going down to the local level. We have a resolution coming to the floor soon, Mr. Chairman, that is going to stipulate that we ought to, as a mat-

ter of bipartisan policy at the national level, try to get 90 percent, 90 cents of every Federal education tax dollar, down into the classroom, ideally used to pay someone who knows that child's name.

Mr. Chairman, I have to again just hope, and we will be examining this in the authorizing committee, I think that is part of our legitimate oversight responsibility, how this money is spent. If we had this, again if we could do it any other way, I would say send it to meet the one mandate we impose on every State and local school district, and that is to comply with IDEA, the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, to provide special education to children with learning disabilities.

If we really want to try a novel idea of educational reform, why do we not do this: We will grant the \$200 million, but let us take \$200 million to put it in scholarships for these same children, for low-income families whose children attend unsafe or underperforming schools.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, let me simply say in response that this is not the reform de jour. This proposal is the result of 20 years of research to determine what works and what does not, what is effective and what is bull gravy, to be blunt about it.

I would also say that I do not expect that this is going to be the be all and end all in terms of improving school performance. If I had my way, I think the most important thing the Federal Government could do is to say that there would not be a single dime in Federal money to any State for education purposes until they reform their State aid distribution formulas.

It is outrageous that my own State, for instance, has a State aid formula that gives Maple, WI, one of the poorest rural districts in my State, pennies in comparison to the huge amount of aid or the huge amount of money that Maple Bluff and Maple Grove, two very wealthy suburbs in my State, can spend, in part because of the unjust school aid formula.

I would also point out with respect to special education that these programs have been demonstrated to greatly reduce the need for placement of people in special education by attacking the problem up front, and I think that is the way we ought to go.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 3¾ minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the agreement, and thank the ranking member and the chairman for really putting forth this incredibly wise decision in terms of comprehensive school reform.

Parents and students know that the key to a good job is a good education.

We know our schools need to be held to the highest educational standards. We know that years of educational reform have produced mixed results.

We do not know all that we need to do to bring our schools up to scratch, but we know what does not work. That is trying to fix one classroom, one course and one group of kids at a time. We know what we need is school-wide comprehensive reform.

That is why these funds are needed, to give struggling schools an opportunity to learn about and implement school-wide models which can bring school levels up all over, and achievement levels up all over the country.

I am very proud of the Comer model of schools. Jim Comer is from my district. Jim Comer produced and developed the school-wide model that is being used not just in New Haven, CT, but in schools in 25 States across the country, and in other countries around the world. It has proved particularly effective for schools with higher than average numbers of disadvantaged and poor-performing students.

The New Haven schools are reaffirming their commitment to the Comer model. With only 16 schools in the district participating in the Comer renewal so far, scores on the Connecticut master test have risen district-wide between 3 and 16 percent. Participating schools scored 300 percent higher in measures of school climate improvement, including school safety, than nonparticipating schools.

Just last week Yale University announced the findings of a study of schools which have participated in the Comer renewal from 1992 to 1996. Researchers found significant improvement in students' attitudes toward school and a sense of safety on campus. Teens in Comer renewal schools showed improvements in race relations, reduced violence, declines in drug use, and less high-risk sexual activity.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues on this side and the other side of the aisle, I would love to have them come to New Haven, CT, to visit the Comer schools. I have sat in the planning and management meetings, I have sat with the parent teams, I have sat with the staff support and the mental health teams as they go about trying to create overall comprehensive reform and to turn the climate of these schools around.

If we provide \$200 million for scholarships all over the country, that is a good and noble cause. In fact, it has an effect on an individual child. It does not get at what we must do in fact to do something about public education in this country, make it what it has been in the past.

This model is not only working in New Haven, CT. Prince Georges County, MD, is represented by my colleagues, the gentlemen from Maryland, Mr. HOYER and Mr. WYNN, where they have implemented the Comer model there, which has tripled the number of students scoring satisfactory or excellent on State exams in the last 3 years.

It has brought dramatic decreases in attendance and discipline problems.

Mr. Chairman, this model may not work for all schools, but all schools should have the opportunity to learn about it and to decide if it in fact is right for their community. That is what the opportunity is in these funds. It is our responsibility to help ensure that every child in this Nation has a shot at the American dream.

I compliment my colleagues, and I compliment the chairman and the ranking member.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I appreciate the work of Mr. RIGGS and Ms. NORTHUP in working out this compromise that will give greater education resources to local and State agencies.

This amendment goes to the heart of the debate over our Nation's education system. Shall we waste taxpayer's money on untested programs or shall we return money to State and local agencies that will give parents the resources they need to educate their children? Shall we return to the days of new math and open classrooms, where untested theories from so-called education experts confused countless school children? Or shall we give parents the tools they need to educate their children for the next century?

Mr. Chairman, I believe that all of us, on the right and on the left, share a desire to improve our Nation's education system. But we disagree on the best way to achieve that result. Liberals believe that money can best be spent at the national level. That is why they support increased funding for the Department of Education, national testing, and this program establishing whole school reform. Conservatives believe that education reform can best be achieved at the local level, with maximum parental involvement. We believe that each child deserves the best education possible and that sacrificing some children in the name of reform is a terrible mistake.

Whole school reform has had some success at the local level, especially in Kentucky, as my colleague, Ms. NORTHUP, has explained. But it has had some notable failures as well. To now invest millions of dollars on a reform program that has had mixed success at best is a risk I am not willing to take, and I am pleased that we have succeeded in replacing this provision with one that favors State flexibility.

Why am I reluctant to fund the whole school program created in this bill? Let me give you two reasons.

First, the program comes disguised as a carrot, but it would act as a stick that would force local school districts to try this untested theory. School districts struggling to make budgets, buy books, and pay teachers would look at this pot of money as manna from heaven. But actually this money would prove to be fool's gold for school districts that are reluctant to try one more Washington-backed education theory. I would much rather return this money back to States and local agencies, through block grants, and let them improve education as they see fit.

Second, Congress would again be spending money without the necessary oversight and review process. We have had no hearings on this program in the authorizing committee. In fact, this program was authorized in 1994 with one line in the Improving America's Schools

Act. That's it. One line. Now, 3 years later, this bill proposes to fund such a program, with little debate or scrutiny. Has the whole school reform approached worked? The jury is still out.

In Kentucky, public school enrollment has decreased dramatically and some schools have actually had to advertise to attract students. And some of what I have read makes me nervous. In one model, "staff, parents and students find their own way to transform themselves." In another, a purpose for a fourth grade class was defined as "we work for good health."

One expert describes Kentucky's experiment this way: "Kentucky's restructured education system frowns on such things as memorization, drill and review, textbooks, desks in rows, structure of any sort, lectures by teachers—they are now called 'guides' and 'facilitators'—and basic academic skills which are now disdainfully referred to as 'lower order thinking skills.'" In my view, the reasons our schools are in their current mess is because too many students haven't mastered the lower order thinking skills of reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Mr. Chairman, I don't believe the Federal Government should be promoting new age education at the expense of traditional approaches. Reforming and improving our schools is an ongoing process, based on common sense and parental involvement.

The Whole Schools Reform Program in this bill is a poster child for big government, full of untested theories, and unnecessary Federal mandates. I am pleased that we are rejecting this approach, and urge my colleagues to support the Riggs amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS].

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other amendments at this point in the bill?

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

IMPACT AID

For carrying out programs of financial assistance to federally affected schools authorized by title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, \$796,000,000, of which \$667,000,000 shall be for basic support payments under section 8003(b), \$40,000,000 shall be for payments for children with disabilities under section 8003(d), \$62,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for payments under section 8003(f), \$7,000,000 shall be for construction under section 8007, and \$20,000,000 shall be for Federal property payments under section 8002.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. HAYWORTH

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment No. 40.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 40 offered by Mr. HAYWORTH:

Page 66, line 7, after "\$796,000,000" insert "(increased by \$18,000,000)".

Page 66, line 12, after "\$7,000,000" insert "(increased by \$18,000,000)".

Page 82, line 6, after "\$174,661,000" insert "(increased by \$18,000,000)".

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be offering a bipartisan amendment with my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Mis-

issippi, Mr. GENE TAYLOR, that will benefit some of the poorest children in America. The amendment will increase funding for the section 8007 program of the Impact Aid Program which funds school construction, and it will increase that aid from \$7 million to \$25 million. To offset this increase, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] and I propose to reduce funding for the National Labor Relations Board, or NLRB, by \$18 million.

Mr. Chairman, as many Members know, Impact Aid funds children's education on military bases and on Indian lands. Because these areas lack an adequate tax base or bonding capacity, they often cannot meet the educational needs of their children, and that is just wrong. The Federal Government has an obligation to educate children who reside on Federal land.

Indeed, helping to meet those needs is the purpose of the Impact Aid Program. Yet, the funding level in this bill will bring this vitally important program only to its fiscal year 1979 level. One section of Impact Aid that has received woefully inadequate funding is the school construction program or section 8007. While the bill does increase construction funding from \$4 million to \$7 million, and let me thank my colleague and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for that, the fact remains this will hardly make a dent in the sad state of federally impacted schools in my district and in other districts across the United States.

As the chairman knows, I represent the Sixth District of Arizona, a unique district because it has the distinction of being the most federally impacted congressional district. Indeed, it also is unique because it has the largest Native American population in the 48 contiguous States.

The Navajo Nation, which stretches across portions of four States and is roughly the size of the State of West Virginia, is the largest and one of the poorest sovereign Indian nations, with staggering unemployment rates, which can be as high as 50 percent, depending on the season. It is apparent that education is the only way for the children of the Navajo Nation to build economic empowerment and escape a life of poverty.

Moreover, educating the children on our reservations is a moral obligation we simply cannot ignore. The other seven tribes I represent in my sprawling district face similar hardships and depend on Impact Aid to help educate their youth. The sad fact is that many of the schools on military bases and Indian lands are in decrepit condition. Many school buildings on the Navajo Nation are cracking, leaking, or falling apart and would be condemned if it were not for the fact that students need to be educated and are required by law to attend classes. Unfortunately, there is not enough money in the construction budget for schools that desperately need to be replaced or renovated.

I would note that the average school in the United States costs nearly \$6 million to build. This bill's funding for school construction of \$7 million would only allow us to build the equivalent of one school each year.

Mr. Chairman, there is need for more than one school a year in my district alone. Section 8007 must be increased substantially if we are to effectively educate our children on Federal lands in a safe and healthy environment. Indeed, when Congress reauthorized the Impact Aid law in 1994 and created section 8007, it envisioned this part of the Impact Aid Program to be funded at a minimum of \$25 million each year.

Section 8007 has only been appropriated to \$5 million in each of the last few years, and the money has yet to be distributed to any school districts. Not only that, but a study by the National Association of Federally Impacted Schools, or NAFIS, recently concluded that \$25 million is the amount needed to help address the construction needs of federally impacted school districts. So full funding of section 8007 would compensate for the inability of heavily impacted districts to raise construction funds on their own.

□ 1615

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us compare the situation of these federally impacted schoolchildren with the bureaucracy of the NLRB from which we propose to offset the funding increase for school construction.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, on the Navajo reservation in my district, school buildings are literally falling down around students. I am sure that many of my colleagues from other federally impacted districts could make similar claims.

The NLRB, on the other hand, occupies a posh building in one of the most prestigious parts of Washington, DC, at a cost of \$21 million a year. Children on the reservation are often underfed and malnourished.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HAYWORTH was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, children on the reservation are often underfed and malnourished and lack the proper books and supplies. But at the NLRB, all five Board members have their own showers, kitchens, libraries, and are provided with clean linen weekly.

And get this, Mr. Chairman, while the schools on our military bases and reservations struggle to attract and retain qualified teachers, each Board member of the NLRB has 18 to 22 lawyers on his staff, while the NLRB general counsel employs 628 lawyers at an average salary of more than \$76,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, in almost every survey I have seen, the American people list education as their top priority. We

have a chance to do something to improve education today in a very helpful way by increasing funding for the construction of schools on some of our Federal lands to serve some of the poorest children in America.

By contrast, Mr. Chairman, I have not seen one survey citing clean linen for high-priced lawyers as a pressing national problem. In short, Mr. Chairman, is there anyone in this Chamber who really believes that the NLRB needs the \$18 million more than the children on our reservations and military bases? Because, Mr. Chairman, that is the simple choice before us today.

I do not want to make it sound as if this Congress has not tried to tighten the reins on the NLRB. On the contrary, I am pleased that the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education has frozen funding for the NLRB over the past few years. Nevertheless, the NLRB can and should get by on less. This proposal is not a drastic cut. It is merely a way for us to set our priorities for our scarce Federal dollars in a more human way.

Mr. Chairman, we are confronted with a stark but simple choice: lawyers or children, bureaucrats or schools. Mr. Chairman, again I would say this amendment is a straightforward choice: Lawyers or children, bureaucracy or schools. I implore the Members to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RIGGS) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend and colleague from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] said that he has the most heavily impacted congressional district in America. I have, perhaps, one of the most heavily impacted school districts in America with the largest naval training facility in the world at Great Lakes as part of my district. Impact Aid is very important to this Member personally, as well as very important to a number of Members in the House of Representatives and to most of our States.

Mr. Chairman, we have done everything we possibly can to raise funding

in this area. In 1996, we provided \$693 million, and in 1998, we provide \$796 million, a \$100 million increase. We have increased section (f). We have increased construction. The President suggested \$4 million for this account; we are raising it to \$7 million, almost double what the President has suggested. We have raised funding for Federal property. It is a high priority with me, and I know that the gentleman from Arizona realizes this.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment would quintuple the appropriation for construction in a single year and would represent more than a sixfold increase over the President's request. That level of funding certainly has not been justified or even suggested in any of the budget hearings we held this year.

Regarding the offset, the committee bill already reduces NLRB by \$11.8 million below the President's request. It provides level funding compared to fiscal year 1997. I have to say that the NLRB was funded at \$170.3 million in fiscal 1996. It would be funded in fiscal 1998 at \$174.6 million, a very, very small increase over the last 3 years.

In total, the NLRB is funded at \$1.4 million below the amount provided by the last Democratic Congress in fiscal year 1995. And when one considers that the NLRB budget is almost entirely salaries and expenses, this 1 percent reduction since 1995 is actually closer to a 10-percent real cut, because the Agency has had to absorb mandatory pay and benefit increases in each of the last 3 years.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Arizona that I am no fan of this administration's NLRB. I think in many instances Chairman Gould has politicized the institution beyond anybody's imagination, and I feel that that is a serious problem for our country. But I would also say to the gentleman that the NLRB is part of a system that we have devised to resolve disputes in our economic system between management and labor in a lawful way without violence; hopefully, without interruptions of work. Its day-to-day work in resolving cases that are filed before it is very important. When we cut too heavily into an agency's resources, all we do is create a backlog of cases that makes it much more difficult for these disputes to be resolved in a reasonable way. I do not think that simply cutting its budget is a productive approach at all, even given our frustration over the political nature that I believe Chairman Gould has given to this Agency, and I think very unfortunately.

So on balance, I think we have done very well by Impact Aid and very well by Impact Aid construction. I think the cut in NLRB, while in certain ways I would agree with the gentleman from Arizona, would be unwise in this circumstance.

We have level-funded it. It amounts to a cut. I think the committee has done a very good job in creating a balance between these two accounts, and I